

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

- - -

GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

- - -

OSU ENDEAVOR CENTER
1862 SHYVILLE ROAD
PIKETON, OHIO
THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2007
5:30 P.M.

- - -

DIANA L. HODGE
RENO & ASSOCIATES
POST OFFICE BOX 594
WAVERLY, OHIO 45690

1 THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

2 March 8, 2007

3 - - -

4 P R O C E E D I N G S

5 MR. BLACK: Good evening, ladies and
6 gentleman. It's really overpowering to see all of
7 you here with standing room only. We're really
8 looking forward to your statements tonight.

9 As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon indicated,
10 this is a scoping meeting. I welcome you to the
11 scoping meeting for the Global Nuclear Energy
12 Partnership.

13 FROM FLOOR: Can you speak louder? We
14 can't hear back here.

15 MR. BLACK: I will definitely speak up.
16 This is actually a very crucial meeting because part
17 of the --

18 FROM FLOOR: Not loud enough.

19 MR. BLACK: Can't hear yet, huh?

20 FROM FLOOR: Give us a bigger room.

21 MR. BLACK: We're definitely sorry about
22 the room. I'll just hold this in my hand and we'll
23 go from there. How about that?

24 As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon indicated,
25 this is a very important meeting, because it is a

1 meeting in the early part of our decision making
2 process where you get the opportunity to be heard
3 and give us your statements, your concerns, your
4 issues that will be considered as we go forward with
5 this important decision.

6 We are here tonight because there is a
7 group here that responded to a DOE request to
8 indicate which public or private organizations would
9 be willing to look at their site to determine
10 whether it would be willing to host one or more of
11 the facilities that we have under consideration here
12 for the GNEP proposal. The organization that
13 responded here is something called the Piketon
14 Initiative for Nuclear Independence. They responded
15 to the funding opportunity request that we issued in
16 August of 2006, and you are one of the 11
17 communities that so responded. But you're also one
18 of 13 communities that will be considered for one or
19 more of these facilities. I will show you that
20 later in a couple of our slides. The two other
21 facilities are DOE national laboratories that
22 were -- that we are -- that DOE selected for further
23 consideration of one or more of these facilities.
24 We will get to that later.

25 Before we provide you an opportunity to

1 make statements, let me describe how we wish to
2 proceed tonight. To put the GNEP proposal into
3 prospective, I would like to first provide an
4 overview of nuclear power and spent fuel management
5 as it exists today and could exist under GNEP.

6 Next I'll explain how the NEPA process
7 will help us analyze the GNEP impacts and
8 alternatives, both programmatic and facility
9 specific proposals. In order to help you formulate
10 your statements, I would like to provide you with
11 some information on the GNEP program. I would also
12 like to explain the NEPA process and how it provides
13 an infrastructure in a process by which we will make
14 what I will call a fully-informed and hopefully -- a
15 fully-informed decision based on sound facts and
16 considerations. And as Assistant Secretary Spurgeon
17 said, your statements here tonight will be
18 considered in that analysis of potential impacts.

19 Then I will talk about the Programmatic
20 Environmental Impact Statement and where we stand in
21 that process, and I'll present a few slides on that.
22 So, let's get started.

23 Here's kind of an outline of how I wish to
24 proceed. Let's start with nuclear power basics.
25 Nuclear power basics. Nuclear power provides 20

1 percent of the electricity in the United States. In
2 certain countries, like France, it provides about 80
3 percent.

4 Nuclear powers do not emit air pollution
5 or greenhouse gases and provides 70 percent of
6 emission free electricity generation in the United
7 States today. The other 30 percent mainly is
8 hydropower, but there's some wind and some solar as
9 well.

10 A typical commercial nuclear power plant
11 generates electricity by a fissioning process.
12 That's the splitting of uranium to produce heat and
13 drive a turbine. Here's the uranium fuel in a
14 reactor core. When control rods are removed from
15 the reactor core, it starts the fissioning process.
16 The fissioning process creates energy. Energy then
17 is transferred to water, which is circulated through
18 the core. The water is then circulated into a steam
19 generator and the boiling water, through steam
20 generator tubes, transfers its energy to produce
21 steam. The steam then goes outside the reactor
22 containment, goes to a turbine building, the
23 turbines turn by the steam and, in turn, turns the
24 electrical generation that produces electricity.

25 After completing an operating cycle,

1 typically 18 to 24 months, some uranium fuel is
2 considered used up or spent, as we call it, and must
3 be replaced with fresh fuel. Now, this doesn't
4 involve replacing all of the fuel in the core,
5 because we do it in stages, so we will remove part
6 of the fuel bundles. The fuel bundles are removed,
7 they are put into a spent fuel cooling pool on site,
8 and then when they are cooled down and decayed
9 sufficiently, we place them in spent fuel casts that
10 are located currently on site at 103 facilities
11 throughout the United States.

12 Now, there are two approaches to spent
13 fuel management. There's the once through or open
14 cycle. This is -- as Assistant Secretary Spurgeon
15 said, we consider the used up fuel to be spent. It
16 will then be sufficiently cooled down and decayed so
17 that we can transport it openly off site or to a
18 geologic repository for ultimately disposition.

19 The GNEP proposal, as Assistant Secretary
20 Spurgeon indicated, is a new way of looking at spent
21 fuel. Spent fuel contains still tremendous amounts
22 of energy that could be reconstituted in new fuel
23 and burned in a new reactor that I'll describe
24 later. This is a closed cycle, because we
25 continuously recycle the fuel so that the

1 transuranics will be used up completely.

2 What is compelling us to propose GNEP at
3 this time? I think we all recognize that the global
4 economy is extremely expanding. If we can just look
5 at what's happening in China and India today, those
6 expanding economies need electricity. There's no
7 question about it. We say it's going to double in
8 approximately 20, 30 years and, in deed, that need
9 for electricity to drive the industries in all of
10 these countries indicates that all of these
11 countries are going to be looking at the nuclear
12 option for production of their electricity demands.
13 So we want to pursue ways to increase energy from
14 diverse sources in ways that protect and improve the
15 environment and enhance our nation's energy
16 security. That is the overall mission of GNEP.

17 Here's the NEPA process. NEPA requires
18 consideration of potential environmental impacts of
19 proposed federal actions. This process does
20 include, as a very important element, public
21 involvement to help the federal decision maker to
22 make a fully-informed decision.

23 The document that we produce under NEPA is
24 an Environmental Impact Statement. This is a
25 document that -- for instance here for GNEP, DOE

1 will consider a full range of alternatives in the
2 EIS and we will assess potential environmental
3 issues and potential impacts.

4 We've decided for GNEP though, because
5 it's a fairly broad program, that we will develop an
6 Environmental Impact Statement that's called a
7 Programmatic Environmental Statement. This is
8 prepared for a broad program, such as GNEP, and
9 broad program meaning we have multiple facilities
10 under consideration at possibly multiple sights and
11 clearly with both domestic and international
12 implications. This is a broad federal action and we
13 need a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
14 to assess, in a comprehensive manner, those broad
15 alternatives and impacts.

16 Where we are in this process right now is
17 at the public scoping meeting. Here's where we are
18 in the process now. We are at this process now
19 because we originally noticed advanced notice of
20 intent and notices of intent on these dates to give
21 you and our other stakeholders notice of what we
22 were proposing in the GNEP proposal.

23 We expect to issue a draft Programmatic
24 Environmental Statement in the Summer of 2007. It
25 will also give you another opportunity to provide

1 comment to the draft PEIS. That comment period, we
2 expect, will expire in the Fall of 2007. This will
3 lead to a final Programmatic Environmental Impact
4 Statement in the late spring. Ultimately the
5 Secretary will issue a decision, which we're now
6 expecting in June of 2008.

7 The purpose of the GNEP Programmatic
8 Environmental Statement is to assess reasonable
9 alternatives that encourage the expansion of
10 world-wide nuclear energy production, reduce nuclear
11 proliferation risks, and I'll explain that a little
12 bit later, and reduce the volume, the thermal output
13 and radiotoxicity of spent fuel before disposal in a
14 geologic repository.

15 The domestic programmatic alternatives
16 that we're going to be looking at are two. One is
17 really a no-action alternative. It will be
18 continuing the once-through spent fuel management
19 program that we have. It will say that we'll have
20 103 commercial reactors and possibly more in the
21 future that will have this once-through spent fuel
22 management program where, as I indicated, once the
23 fuel is removed from the core, it will be cooled off
24 at sight and openly disposed of at a geologic
25 repository.

1 But we will also continue doing nuclear
2 fuel cycle research and development, just as we have
3 been doing for years and years and years at DOE
4 national laboratories and even in some commercial
5 laboratories. We are looking at a full range of
6 nuclear technologies to advance the nuclear option
7 as we move forward.

8 The second programmatic alternative that
9 we're going to be looking at is the GNEP proposed
10 action. It will include a broad implementation of a
11 closed fuel cycle that includes one or more nuclear
12 fuel recycling centers and one or more recycling
13 reactors. With respect to the second proposal,
14 we're conducting project-specific analysis. We
15 haven't made a decision on this, but we are
16 conducting project-specific analysis to determine
17 where to site, construct and operate any or all
18 three of the GNEP fuel cycle facilities that I will
19 talk about here.

20 The first domestic fuel cycle facility
21 that will support GNEP is a nuclear fuel recycling
22 center. This recycling center will have several
23 purposes. It will recycle. In other words, it will
24 separate out the usable constituents of spent fuel,
25 the uranium and transuranics. Transuranics are

1 anything above uranium in the atomic table,
2 including plutonium, and it will also cycle out the
3 non-usable or the waste constituents without
4 separating out pure plutonium.

5 There's a couple points to be made here.
6 Without separating out pure plutonium is a different
7 type of technology. It's not the MOX technology,
8 mixed oxide fuel technology. It is separating out
9 plutonium with some other radioisotopes in it. So
10 it's pure plutonium, which is weapons-free material
11 without much other things that need to be done with
12 it. We don't want it separated out that way. So
13 the pure plutonium would be separated -- the
14 plutonium will be separated out with radioactive
15 isotopes that will not lead -- without further
16 chemical treatment for that to be weapons-free
17 material. This is a proliferation risk reduction
18 effort that we're pursuing under GNEP. This
19 recycling center will also fabricate fuel from the
20 transuranics for use in the advanced recycling
21 reactor.

22 Now, the Programmatic Environmental Impact
23 Statement will assess both alternative technologies.
24 We're looking at a range of new technologies,
25 starting with UREX and COEX, and that means the

1 extraction technique, so we're looking at different
2 technologies, which are chemical processing
3 technologies to do what we're trying to do in
4 separating out and recycling out uranium and the
5 transuranics.

6 We're also going to be looking at various
7 alternative spent fuel throughputs. Now, the lower
8 end of the throughputs that we'll be looking at,
9 let's say the 100 metric tons annually, is more like
10 an engineering scale facility. So this is kind of
11 like -- maybe if we recognize, as we go down this
12 path in looking at our technologies, we may want to
13 say that we're going to have to demonstrate a
14 technology in a smaller scale facility. That's an
15 engineering demonstration.

16 The upper end of this is more what we
17 would call a commercial application, and that means
18 that we think that the technology is well proven and
19 we can go right into a commercial, fairly
20 large-scale recycling operation.

21 The advanced recycling reactor is a
22 different type of reactor than is deployed in the
23 United States today. In the United States today, we
24 use commercial -- it's a light-water reactor where
25 you use water as a moderator. This is going to be a

1 fast neutron reactor that will be designed
2 specifically to transform and burn up the
3 transuranic elements while at the same time
4 producing electricity to put out on the power grids.

5 The proposed technology that we're looking
6 at right now is a sodium-cooled fast reactor. The
7 reason that we're looking at that as kind of a base
8 technology is that we do have some experience with
9 sodium-cooled fast reactors, both domestically here
10 in the United States at DOE as well as
11 internationally. Some of our partner nations that
12 I'll talk about later have some good experience with
13 sodium-cooled fast reactors.

14 Again, the Programmatic Environmental
15 Impact Statement will analyze various alternative
16 ratings for this reactor starting at the low end,
17 more like an engineering scale reactor, ultimately
18 going up to a fairly good commercial reactor.

19 Now, as I say -- we say in the footnote
20 that these two facilities could be privately owned
21 and operated. In other words we believe that they
22 can go to the commercial scale application. We have
23 a bush of entities out there that have voiced
24 interest in having it do -- having -- deploying this
25 as a commercial operation, a for profit operation,

1 but to make it go, we recognize we're still going to
2 have to have some DOE supplied incentives and some
3 other government involvement, too, to make sure that
4 it does all the things that we wish it to do in
5 terms of safety and security.

6 The last facility is the advanced fuel
7 cycle research facility. It will support research
8 and development relating to separation technologies.
9 As I indicated, we have a range of different
10 technologies that we're looking at. This is not the
11 old PUREX technology which leads to mixed oxide
12 fuels, but it is a new process starting with UREX
13 and some other ones that we're looking at a DOE
14 national laboratories now.

15 Also, we're looking at R&D to develop the
16 transmutation fuel that we're looking for the
17 transuranics -- to burn off the transuranics in the
18 advanced fuel reactor -- advanced recycling reactor.

19 This fuel cycle research facility will be
20 the facility to do that, that fabricates the first
21 fuel elements for the first reactor, too. So once
22 we demonstrate that in this research development
23 facility, we will then move that fuel to fabrication
24 in the first facility that I mentioned, the
25 recycling center.

1 This fuel research facility will also be a
2 long-term research and development facility for
3 advanced fuel cycle technologies. It will be built
4 and operated at a DOE site. So in other words, one
5 of our sites -- one of our national laboratory sites
6 will be selected for this R&D facility. We want to
7 restore leadership, world leadership for the U.S. in
8 terms of advanced nuclear technologies, and this R&D
9 center will lead that. We expect that we will
10 employ -- we will bring over foreign researchers,
11 too, to help us out. As I indicated, this is part
12 of the global part of GNEP that I'll talk about.

13 These are the sites that will be assessed
14 in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
15 to determine potential locations for one or more of
16 these facilities. You can see here that the
17 Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant is given as a DOE
18 owned site and it's being considered for a couple of
19 the facilities. Here are the non-DOE sites that
20 have also been selected by DOE for further looking
21 at.

22 Now, we will use a screening process
23 through the NEPA process to determine which of these
24 sites will be able to support one or more of these
25 facilities and, perhaps, some of these sites will be

1 screened out because they don't have the requisite
2 site characteristics that are needed to support the
3 facilities under consideration.

4 When I talk about that, I'm talking about,
5 do we have sufficient water? Do we have a
6 sufficient infrastructure? Do we have the right
7 land use for these? What's the population density
8 look like? So a bunch of these things will be
9 determined, and some of these sites may or may not
10 be screened out as we go through this process that
11 we're just beginning right now.

12 Here are the various sites, the 13 sites,
13 and here are the facilities that we are considering.
14 These are in your handout materials. You can see
15 for Portsmouth, the Portsmouth site is being
16 considered for the fuel recycling center and the
17 advanced recycling reactor. Here's that just in a
18 nutshell.

19 What are the international GNEP
20 initiatives and proposals that we're looking at?
21 Well, we want to work with our partner nations not
22 only to restore U.S. leadership in this effort, but
23 we want to work with our partner nations to -- when
24 I talk about partner nations, I'm talking about
25 those nations right now that have advanced nuclear

1 technology capability. We're talking about
2 countries such as France, England, Russia, Japan and
3 perhaps Canada.

4 What we want to do is establish two
5 programs with our international partners. The first
6 is a fuel services program. So for those countries
7 that want to pursue the nuclear option to meet their
8 future energy needs -- and believe me, there's a lot
9 of -- I see them almost weekly. I see a new country
10 almost weekly on some of the material I get. Namibia
11 (sic) was the last one I saw. Namibia wants to work
12 with the Russians to develop a floating nuclear
13 power plant for the production of nuclear
14 electricity as well as desalination.

15 So you can see there's a range of
16 countries -- you will see a range of countries that
17 are pursuing the nuclear option. There's a range of
18 our partner nations, including Russia, that are more
19 than willing to help them develop that nuclear
20 option through the use of their technologies.

21 So what we're going to do is try to get
22 agreements with our global partners so that if
23 Namibia, for instance, or Estonia, wants to have a
24 reactor, we will say, okay, we will supply you a
25 reactor -- I'll talk about that in a second. We

1 will supply you a reactor and we will provide the
2 fuel for you if you agree not to pursue enrichment
3 as well as reprocessing programs. Now, these are
4 the programs that could lead to the development of
5 nuclear weapons. So these countries could possibly,
6 if we didn't have this agreement in place, take the
7 spent fuel and enrich it or separate it out for
8 production of nuclear grade material. We want to
9 preclude that. So if we work with those countries
10 and work those agreements, hopefully we can go a
11 long way to preclude that option and preclude that
12 desire and hopefully shut it down.

13 The other thing that we're going to pursue
14 with our partner nations is a reactor program. Now,
15 as I indicated, Russia is considering working with
16 Namibia in the initial stages of agreement. Russia
17 has advanced reactors. We have advanced reactors.
18 France has advanced reactors. We're all willing to
19 work with other international countries to get them
20 that technology if they have an energy need.

21 But these new reactors are different.
22 They are small reactors that are anywhere from 100
23 to 500 megawatts electric. They are based on
24 advanced technologies, what we call inherently safe
25 technologies. They cannot melt down. They are

1 right sized for the country's needs, energy
2 development needs, and they are going to be modular.
3 They are modular so that a lot of the fabrication of
4 these reactors will be done offsite, possibly at
5 Russia selling to Namibia. The Russians will develop
6 the right size reactor back in Russia and fabricate
7 it there and ship some of the -- many of the parts
8 and pieces of equipment and systems to Namibia for
9 fabrication at that site.

10 Part of this what we call a safe secure
11 reactor -- we're looking at this, and I know at
12 Livermore National Laboratory, they have developed
13 some concepts for fairly long-term use of fuel. So
14 they are developing fuel characteristics that we
15 could put in a reactor and that fuel could last for
16 30 or 40 years without having to refuel that reactor
17 and treat the spent fuel. So there's some
18 interesting things being done, and we want to work
19 with our partner nations to make sure it's done
20 right for safe and secure nuclear operations.

21 Also, these safe secure reactors are going
22 to be very very different to operate. I mean, they
23 will have much less systems in place. They will be
24 less complex reactors to work with. The operators
25 will -- it will be more of a computerized operation

1 than anything else. That's why I say that they are
2 going to be save secure reactors based on advanced
3 technologies.

4 With respect to the international
5 initiative, right now we are not in a position to
6 propose anything in the GNEP proposal as it stands
7 right now. The international initiatives have to
8 work out on their own. So what we're going to do in
9 the GNEP Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
10 is to kind of look in these things in a very broad
11 qualitative sense and give a rough feel for the
12 global impacts as well as the U.S. impacts that
13 these international initiatives might have.

14 Here's a list of some environmental issues
15 that will be assessed in the GNEP PEIS. As you can
16 see, these environmental issues range from potential
17 impacts on people, potential impacts on property,
18 potential impacts on land, air, water, economic
19 issues, socioeconomic issues, environmental justice
20 issues. We'll look at a full range of accidents as
21 well as terroristic acts in terms of what could be
22 the possible potential issues associated with these.

23 As I indicated, the secretary's record of
24 decision is expected in June of 2008. The
25 secretary's record of decision will determine

1 whether to proceed with the construction and
2 operation of the GNEP recycling facilities,
3 including what technologies and capacities and where
4 they could possibly be located.

5 The DOE's decision, the secretary's
6 decision, will be based on not only information from
7 the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, but
8 also information relating to things such as economic
9 considerations. We have to build a business case
10 here if we're going to support commercial operation.

11 It will also be looking at a range of
12 technical information as well as policy information.
13 I say the policy information because the congress's
14 Energy Policy Act of 2005 dictated and mandated to
15 DOE that we have to consider a full range of energy
16 issues and energy policy. This ranges from clean
17 coal technology to the nuclear technology to
18 renewable energy options such as wind and solar.
19 We're looking big time at ethanol production for
20 energy use.

21 So there's a lot of things at play here
22 domestically that is on the secretary's plate. Many
23 things could change between now and 2008.
24 Technology may change. So consequently, the PEIS
25 will look at a range of environmental issues and

1 alternative technologies, but clearly the
2 secretary's decision a year and a half from now will
3 have to look at everything that's unfolding under
4 the Energy Policy Act as well as things that are
5 unfolding globally. It's a fairly good and robust
6 moving target.

7 How can you help us make a sound decision?
8 I think we have stated this several times. This is
9 your opportunity tonight to present information to
10 us that you feel is important for us to consider
11 regarding the potential impacts of these facilities
12 on you, on your community as well as your
13 environmental neighborhood. So it's important for
14 you to have the opportunity to give us that
15 information.

16 As this process moves forward in the next
17 year and a half or so, stay informed. Here's a
18 website that you can get to. We will continuously
19 update that information. It will be rich in
20 information and hopefully it will be full and
21 complete information as we move forward in this
22 process. You can stay involved. You can sign up
23 for the distribution list for the draft PEIS and
24 provide your comments later on, as we indicated.

25 And if this site is selected for further

1 analysis, we probably will come out here again for
2 another public meeting to talk about where we're at
3 and how this may affect the Portsmouth site. So
4 stay tuned for that as well.

5 How do you provide your comments? You can
6 do that here tonight. They will be on the record,
7 and we will consider them and analyze them as we
8 move forward with the PEIS. You can do it by U.S.
9 Mail, e-mail, telephone, fax. All that information
10 is in your packet.

11 So the comment period for this phase of
12 the scoping process expires April 4th of this year.

13 Again, echoing Assistant Secretary
14 Spurgeon's comments, we thank you for showing this
15 interest. This is just an overwhelming turn out,
16 which indicates that there's overwhelming interest
17 probably both for and against. We are here -- we're
18 certainly here to listen to your statements, and as
19 I indicated, they will be considered.

20 Thank you very much for showing up tonight
21 and being interested and involved.

22 MR. BROWN: Thanks. Before we move onto
23 the next portion of our meeting, let me call on Greg
24 Simonton, who will be announcing some additional
25 public meetings here in this community.

1 MR. SIMONTON: I just wanted to take a
2 brief opportunity to announce that we are
3 conducting -- Southern Ohio Diversification
4 Initiative, part of SONIC, part of ePIFNI, we are
5 hosting a series of public meetings. That process
6 is separate from this, but it is an opportunity for
7 community members to come out and participate. Our
8 first meeting will be on March the 20th in this
9 building, and it will provide an extra opportunity
10 for comment and for information for us to gather as
11 we do our reporting requirements. And then we will
12 provide that information to the Department of
13 Energy. We also will ask in our formal comment on
14 tonight's meeting that they will accept comments
15 that we generate throughout our process as part of
16 their review of the EIS process. Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

18 MR. SIMONTON: One more thing.

19 MR. BROWN: Sure.

20 MR. SIMONTON: We do have a sign-up sheet
21 outside on the right. If you want us to contact you
22 directly, that will be a great opportunity for us to
23 get your information to contact you and send out
24 information about the first meeting on the 20th and
25 subsequent meetings after that. Thank you.

1 FROM FLOOR: What time?

2 MR. BROWN: There was a question?

3 FROM FLOOR: What time?

4 MR. BROWN: So you have times for the
5 meeting?

6 MR. SIMONTON: 6:30.

7 MR. BROWN: 6:30 for his meetings.

8 In the past meetings for this project, at
9 this point we have usually taken a break to ask
10 questions, but in view of the difficulty of
11 everybody getting seated and also the interest in
12 the number of people who signed up, I think we will
13 proceed directly to taking public comment.

14 FROM FLOOR: There will be no questions?

15 MR. BROWN: There are folks in the back
16 room who can answer questions in terms of the panels
17 and information back there, and also they are going
18 to run the video that was run first here if anybody
19 missed that.

20 I think with that, by way of introduction,
21 let me.

22 FROM FLOOR: We object to the lack of
23 question period. That was part of the meeting,
24 clarifying questions that are necessary as part of
25 the process.

1 MR. BROWN: Let me suggest then -- well,
2 maybe I'll be more clear about it. There are folks
3 available in the adjoining room to answer questions.
4 If there are folks who have questions about the
5 presentation about the presentation or about the
6 materials available, you're free to do that. But if
7 you don't have any questions, then I think we should
8 proceed with the public comment period.

9 FROM FLOOR: We do have questions. The
10 presentations were extremely confusing. People,
11 some of whom couldn't even hear the presentations,
12 have questions that are necessary for this to move
13 forward.

14 FROM FLOOR: For everybody here to hear
15 the questions and to hear the answers.

16 MR. BROWN: Well, that's not the
17 advertised format. If people have questions, they
18 are free to go to the other room and pose those
19 questions. We have 60 people signed up to speak and
20 we're -- I think in the interest of people abiding
21 by the schedule --

22 FROM FLOOR: We're protesting the lack of
23 questions and we're demanding another hearing in a
24 larger room with microphones so that this process
25 can have some semblance of democratic --

1 MR. BROWN: That's fair enough. I've run
2 a number of meetings, and often there have been
3 request for additional meetings. I gather you're
4 signed up to speak and you can certainly make that
5 comment when you're up here.

6 FROM FLOOR: Can't the people who are in
7 the other rooms come out here so that we can all ask
8 questions and everybody can hear the answers?

9 MR. BROWN: No.

10 FROM FLOOR: Why can't they just come out
11 here?

12 MR. BROWN: The questions -- we have done
13 this at all our past meetings in this format. We
14 have had questions posed to staff who are available
15 in the other room, and then that can assist you in
16 making comments.

17 We don't have time and it has not been the
18 practice to have questions posed in an open session.
19 We really have got to get started on -- I think most
20 people are interested in hearing their neighbors and
21 friends and their comments. I would like to get
22 started on that and run through the format for that.
23 I'll start calling the names.

24 It's now time to receive your formal
25 comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS. This is

1 your opportunity to let DOE know what you would like
2 to see addressed in the draft document. The court
3 reporter will transcribe your statements.

4 Let me review a few ground rules for
5 formal comments. Please step up to that microphone
6 (indicating) when your name is called, introduce
7 yourself providing information on where you're from
8 and an organization affiliation, where appropriate.

9 If you have a written version of your
10 statement, please provide a copy to the court
11 reporter after you have completed your remarks.
12 Also give the court reporter any additional
13 attachments that you would like to see made part of
14 the formal record.

15 I will call three names at a time. The
16 first is the speaker and the second two are those
17 who will follow, again, to allow people to make
18 their way up front.

19 In view of the number of people who have
20 indicated an interest in speaking, please confine
21 your public statement to three minutes. I will let
22 you know when you have one minute left. I will need
23 your cooperation in this manner in view of the
24 number of people who have signed up.

25 Also I need to comment that all of your

1 statements, whether they are verbal and presented
2 tonight or submitted in any written form carry equal
3 weight. So if you are unable to complete your
4 comments within the three-minute period, if you can
5 conclude in the three-minute period and submit the
6 rest of them, they will count equally in terms of
7 the comment.

8 Mr. Black will be serving as the hearing
9 officer for the Department of Energy during this
10 formal comment period, but he will not be responding
11 to any questions or comments at this time.

12 So let me start with the first person who
13 signed up. We have Bob Clark. Bob Clark will be
14 followed by Christi Mash and Mark Shanahan.

15 Is Bob Clark here? Okay. I will get back
16 to Bob Clark then.

17 FROM FLOOR: He's coming.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay. He apparently is coming
19 in the back way.

20 Again, if you will step to the microphone
21 over there.

22 BOB CLARK

23 commented as follows:

24 MR. CLARK: Thank you. Thanks for the
25 opportunity to be here tonight. This is a statement

1 of Representative David L. Hobson, Ranking Member
2 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, House
3 Committee on Appropriations.

4 I support the efforts of the Southern Ohio
5 Nuclear Integration Cooperative and its member
6 organizations to advocate the Department of Energy's
7 Portsmouth site for consideration under the Global
8 Nuclear Energy Partnership.

9 I believe that the United States must
10 reconsider its historical opposition to the
11 recycling of spent nuclear fuel. The United States
12 needs to maintain nuclear power as a sufficient part
13 of its energy portfolio for reasons of energy
14 independence, limiting greenhouse gas emissions and
15 economic development.

16 Advanced technologies for recycling spent
17 nuclear fuel offer the prospects of addressing both
18 the nonproliferation concerns that surround existing
19 recycling technologies and the possibility of
20 reducing the volume and toxicity of waste products
21 that will require disposal in a geologic repository.

22 Developing an advance recycling technology
23 in the United States will require additional
24 research and development, and eventually the
25 construction of several pilot plants for different

1 aspects of the recycling process.

2 At the direction of congress, the
3 Department of Energy issued a solicitation to
4 identify sites in the United States interested in
5 hosting GNEP facilities. There are a limited number
6 of suitable sites for GNEP facilities, and Piketon,
7 Ohio is fortunate to be one of those sites.

8 Portsmouth is a site with a long history
9 and involvement in nuclear energy. Piketon offers a
10 skilled work force that is expert in working with
11 nuclear materials and a community that is
12 knowledgeable and supportive of this work.

13 GNEP facilities could potentially bring
14 much needed jobs and economic development to
15 Southern Ohio, as well as serving the national needs
16 outlined above.

17 I encourage the community to move forward
18 and work with the department of energy to conduct
19 the detailed siting study for the Portsmouth site.
20 Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Christi Mash, Mark
22 Shanahan will follow and David Daniels after Mark.

23 CHRISTI MASH

24 commented as follows:

25 MS. MASH: Good evening. I will keep my

1 comments brief. I am Christi Mash. I'm the field
2 representative for Congressman Charlie Wilson, who
3 represents this Sixth Congressional District.
4 Unfortunately, the congressman could not be here
5 tonight due to his voting schedule in D.C., so I'm
6 Plan B for this evening.

7 I just wanted to let you know that my role
8 here tonight is to take comments and your concerns
9 back to the congressman. As a freshman congressman,
10 we're keeping the congressman briefed on the
11 situations here and what's happening here at
12 Piketon. I will certainly get your comments back to
13 him and we'll keep involved in the process. Thank
14 you very much for the opportunity to be here
15 tonight. Thank you.

16 (Applause from audience.)

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

18 FROM FLOOR: Where?

19 MS. MASH: You can send your comments --
20 if you want to contact us, I will have some cards in
21 the back. But you can send them to 226 Cannon House
22 Office Building, Washington D.C., care of
23 Congressman Charlie Wilson.

24 FROM FLOOR: Does he have an e-mail?

25 MS. MASH: You can send e-mail to -- yes,

1 you can send e-mail to his chief of staff. She is
2 actually the person who handles his energy issues.
3 Her name is Michele Dallafior. That's
4 michele.dallafior@ --

5 FROM FLOOR: Could you spell it?

6 MS. MASH: Yes, I can. It's French.
7 D-a-l-l-a-f-i-o-r -- @mail.house.gov. It's
8 michele.dallafior@mail.house.gov. Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Mark Shanahan, David Daniels
10 and Tedd West.

11 MARK SHANAHAN

12 commented as follows:

13 MR. SHANAHAN: My name is Mark Shanahan,
14 and I'm Governor Ted Strickland's energy advisor.

15 FROM FLOOR: We can't hear you.

16 MR. SHANAHAN: Governor Strickland
17 appreciates the hard work put in to this proposal
18 process by the people of this community. He also
19 appreciates the depth of feeling on all sides of the
20 discussion about the best use of the Piketon
21 facility. That is why he asked me and other staff
22 to attend tonight's meeting to listen carefully and
23 to add what we learn tonight to the discussions that
24 will inform his decision about whether or not Ohio
25 will agree to be a willing host to this project.

1 You know, from his years of work around
2 the Piketon facility that Governor Strickland
3 consistently balances the economic development
4 opportunities for this site and his deep concerns
5 about community and worker safety.

6 There is no question that for years that
7 people in this part of Ohio have answered their
8 nation's call when asked to host and maintain the
9 enrichment facility at Piketon. Unfortunately the
10 history of that facility teaches us that we must be
11 very careful to ask all the right questions and to
12 receive answers that can be trusted.

13 This project holds out the hope for a
14 massive additional investment in the site and
15 thousands of new jobs if it is developed as
16 promised.

17 But it also holds out the possibility that
18 Piketon will become a permanent repository for spent
19 nuclear fuel rods from across the country. Governor
20 Strickland opposes turning the Piketon facility into
21 a nuclear waste dump.

22 (Applause from audience.)

23 At this stage in the process, we do not
24 believe we have nearly enough information to make an
25 informed decision about whether or not to be a

1 willing host. What technology will be used? Will
2 the proposed technology be licensed by the NRC, or
3 will it be run by DOE? Who will be the
4 owner/operator of the facility? How much spent fuel
5 will be processed through this plant? What are the
6 environmental risks posed by the technology chosen?
7 When will there be sufficient detail available for
8 our experts at the Ohio Environmental Protection
9 Agency to analyze potential emissions and their
10 impacts? When will that level of detail be shared
11 with interested parties at the state and local
12 levels to inform a careful decision?

13 And above all those questions is one based
14 upon the history of this facility. How do we know
15 we can rely upon the answers we receive? If we are
16 promised Piketon will not become a permanent
17 repository, how do we know reprocessing facilities
18 will actually be built and operated?

19 Governor Strickland and you in this
20 community have watched the Department of Energy
21 invest literally billions of dollars in this
22 facility and then change a technology decision and
23 walk away from a project. Congressman Strickland
24 has drafted legislation instructing you, as DOE, to
25 take actions at this facility, seeing that language

1 be passed and signed in to law and then watched it
2 be ignored. Trust is the absolutely critical issue
3 here.

4 Governor Strickland will continue to work
5 with the leaders of this community to get answers to
6 the questions that are essential for any decision.
7 I look forward to listening to your testimony
8 tonight. Thanks.

9 (Applause from audience.)

10 MR. BROWN: Thank you. You were not
11 charged for the applause time.

12 David Daniels, Teddy West and Lewie
13 Pritchett.

14 DAVID DANIELS

15 commented as follows:

16 MR. DANIELS: Thank you very much. My
17 name is David Daniels. I am the state
18 representative for the 86th Ohio House District,
19 which includes Pike County, Highland and Clinton.

20 First of all, I would like to thank the
21 Department of Energy for having the opportunity to
22 be here tonight and presenting this form.

23 Over the last two or three days, I've had
24 the opportunity to work in a bipartisan manner with
25 a number of state legislators that represent this

1 district and districts contiguous to Pike County.
2 Just to name those, there's Senator Kerry,
3 Representative Book, Representative Evans,
4 Representative Schlichter and myself.

5 We are here tonight -- I am here tonight
6 to express our support for this study. As we begin
7 to think about the investment that's possible --
8 that could be possible in this area, we are
9 supportive of the efforts that are being put in to
10 place to study this issue, to make sure that the --
11 that all the criteria are met, that the safety is a
12 primary concern and also the environment of this
13 area. So we are here to let you know that we are
14 supportive of the study and hope that that moves on.

15 We also would like to let you know that we
16 are supportive of this process. Any time that we
17 talk about making an impact one way or another,
18 whether it be jobs, whatever the situation might be
19 on a community, it is so important that the
20 public -- those closely affected by the decisions
21 that are made have the opportunity to have public
22 input into the process, and we applaud this process
23 as well.

24 I hope to have the opportunity to be down
25 here to future public briefings and public comment

1 periods. Just to let you know that as
2 representatives of the area in and around Pike
3 County, we are watching the development of this very
4 closely and look forward to seeing the comments that
5 come out of this meeting this evening. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Teddy West will be
7 followed by Lewie Pritchett and Barbara Lund.

8 TEDDY WEST

9 commented as follows:

10 MR. WEST: I'm Teddy West, your Pike
11 County Commissioner. I'm a retired farmer, a grain
12 farmer and a cattle farmer. I own a farm that
13 adjoins the DOE facility. I have lived here all my
14 life. I am for good safe jobs, good safe -- for the
15 community. I have got kids, I have got grandkids
16 and I want to see good safe jobs here in Pike
17 County. I do support the GNEP study. Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Lewie Pritchett,
19 Barbara Lund will follow and then Eric O'Neil.

20 LEWIE PRITCHETT

21 commented as follows:

22 MR. PRITCHETT: I'm Lewie Pritchett,
23 President of Scioto Township Trustees. I'm a
24 lifetime resident of Scioto Township. My
25 grandfather worked at DOE facilities for 30 some

1 years. I am a supporter of the GNEP study and good
2 safe jobs. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Barbara Lund, Eric O'Neil and
4 Lorry Swain.

5 DELSIE WILSON

6 commented as follows:

7 MS. WILSON: Hello. My name is actually
8 Delsie Wilson. Barbara left a written comment she
9 wanted us to read, and Jackie gave me permission to
10 do so earlier.

11 FROM FLOOR: Please put that closer to
12 your mouth, because we can't hear you.

13 MS. WILSON: Sorry. My name is Delsie
14 Wilson. Barbara Lund gave me a written comment that
15 she wanted me to read, and Jackie gave me permission
16 to do so.

17 It says my name is Barbara Lund. I'm a
18 resident of Adams County, Ohio adjacent and to the
19 west of Scioto and Pike Counties. I am opposed to
20 granting permission for even a study of additional
21 nuclear activity at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion
22 Plant in Piketon, Ohio.

23 I believe that nuclear materials should be
24 dealt with where they are used and waste materials
25 dealt with where produced, and with some few

1 exceptions like medical ones.

2 The hazards of transportation of moving
3 nuclear materials around by air, truck or rail
4 concerns me. Nuclear materials should be moved as
5 little as possible. I am concerned about further
6 pollution of soil in both surface and groundwater at
7 this facility. Any further activity of any type
8 would be polluting.

9 I am not against the use of nuclear
10 materials as such, even for electric or other power
11 energy production. What I object to is government
12 agencies, organizations and companies passing along
13 some of their costs and consequences to others,
14 particularly poor people who lack a strong voice and
15 the natural environment with living organisms which
16 has no voice at all in such decisions.

17 Southern Ohio is known to be economically
18 poor and with low human populations. These are not
19 good reasons to site a waste disposal facility in
20 Piketon. Thank you.

21 (Applause from audience.)

22 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Eric O'Neil, Lorry
23 Swain and Vina Colley.

24 ERIC O'NEIL

25 commented as follows:

1 MR. O'NEIL: Good evening. My name is
2 Eric O'Neil. My wife and I own property in Pike
3 County.

4 I worked as a laborer on the cleanup of
5 the Fernald facility near Cincinnati. I witnessed
6 the transformation of that former uranium production
7 facility into a wildlife refuge and nature preserve.
8 The remediation process provided hundreds of good
9 union jobs for more than 15 years.

10 Instead of creating a sacrifice zone,
11 which GNEP would surely do, I hope to see a complete
12 and safe cleanup with a healthier future for
13 Piketon. Thank you.

14 (Applause from audience.)

15 LORRY SWAIN

16 commented as follows:

17 MS. SWAIN: My name is Lorry Swain. First
18 I want to challenge the order in which things are
19 happening on GNEP. There was somewhat of a secret,
20 the study grants, the PEIS, the scoping meeting. It
21 seems like the process is turned on its head. Why
22 were the grants awarded and public monies passed out
23 on proposals that have never been made public about
24 decisions to locate a major nuclear facility in an
25 area where people have been kept in the dark up

1 until this point? How did all these other steps
2 occur before you even got around to a meeting with
3 the people that would be most affected and put us in
4 a room that won't hold half of us and give us three
5 minutes each to talk after we've listened to your
6 spiel that's written up on this handout for 50
7 minutes? It's really, really frightening.

8 How can we give input about a GNEP
9 proposal that SONIC made for ePIFNI or SODI or
10 whoever they are, that the DOE has and we haven't
11 seen yet? We have asked to see it. The media has
12 asked to see it. Although we have been denied
13 access, we understand that in this proposal, in this
14 grant application, the DOE required that the
15 applicants demonstrate community support for GNEP.
16 I'll quote you on this. The DOE says that a willing
17 populous must surround the site. You awarded a
18 SONIC grant, they probably cashed the check already
19 and this is the first public meeting that we've had.
20 So when and where did it get decided that there's a
21 willing populous surrounding the site?

22 (Applause from audience.)

23 If the grant proposal says that, I really
24 challenge that it's a fraud and it should be voided.

25 We have got an old problem here that fits

1 right in to GNEP. Long ago the DOE was directed to
2 clean up the legacy waste and the contamination from
3 the A-plant. The people were promised a cleanup
4 like the one that was carried out at Fernald, that
5 Eric O'Neil just spoke about.

6 But instead of a cleanup that would
7 improve our chances of the a cancer-free life and
8 that would provide good jobs in the trades for many
9 years, maybe 15 years, and would lead to sustainable
10 production on this reclaimed land, instead of that,
11 we get promised a piece of GNEP.

12 What piece of GNEP will we get? Maybe
13 bringing the spent fuel rods from all over the
14 country and possibly the world? In essence that
15 would be a high-level, radioactive waste dump. If
16 that's the piece, then we're here to say -- many
17 people are here to say that we're not a willing
18 populous.

19 FROM FLOOR: That's right.

20 MR. BROWN: You have about a minute left.

21 MS. SWAIN: Irradiated fuel from nuclear
22 power plants contains the most lethal materials on
23 earth. Yucca Mountain has not been deemed
24 appropriate for storing the spent fuel and Piketon
25 is not appropriate.

1 Since I only have a minute, I'm going to
2 switch over to the proliferation issues.
3 Reprocessing is not recycling. We all know that
4 it's separating out plutonium and uranium and other
5 radioactive materials.

6 Mr. Black, I believe was his name, said
7 that this is proliferation resistant. Yes, it's
8 true that it is compared to PUREX, which was
9 developed specifically to get plutonium to make
10 bombs. But UREX, UREX-1, UREX+, UREX+1 have not
11 been proven. The American Federation of Scientists,
12 The National Academy of Science, The Union of
13 Concerned Scientists, they have all made a statement
14 on this. This is incorrect. It is not true.

15 The plutonium that would be pulled out
16 could be put right through the PUREX process.

17 MR. BROWN: Can you make just one more
18 point?

19 MS. SWAIN: Yes. I wish that we had as
20 much time as you had, sir.

21 (Applause from audience.)

22 MS. SWAIN: I'll wrap it up. Mr. -- the
23 boss, the DOE boss, Samuel Bodman, was asked
24 recently by a congressional committee, what is GNEP
25 about? You're asking us to fund it for millions of

1 dollars today and billions of dollars down the road.
2 We don't know exactly what it is. What it is -- and
3 they pinned him down. This is what he said. It's
4 about research. That's what it is. We don't know
5 where it's going. It's about research. Maybe 20,
6 25 years. It's about research.

7 Well, we don't have research labs here in
8 Piketon. We're working class families that want
9 descent jobs and we want the site cleaned up.

10 Thanks.

11 (Applause from audience.)

12 MR. BROWN: The next speaker is Vina
13 Colley, Henry Spitz will be next and Tressie Hall
14 after Henry.

15 VINA COLLEY

16 commented as follows:

17 MS. COLLEY: Well, Lorry, that's a hard
18 one to follow. My name is Vina Colley and I'm
19 President of Portsmouth/Piketon Residents for
20 Environmental Safety and Security. PRESS would like
21 to thank you for the opportunity to testify.

22 PRESS has been here since the middle of
23 the '80s when the community residents filed a
24 lawsuit because of off-site contamination. The
25 lawsuit includes 5,000 community residents within a

1 ten-mile radius of the plant. The main contaminates
2 was listed as PCBs, trichlorethylene and
3 transuranium.

4 We have been pushing for the real clean up
5 of this plant since I have been a PRESS member in
6 the late '80s. We heard about off-site problems
7 after we read a news clip that said there was
8 off-site contamination coming from the plant.

9 In 1977, the plant wrote that trace
10 quantities of transuranium were probably being
11 released to Little Beaver Creek without any
12 monitoring of these materials. This was a quote
13 from Louise Roselle, her law firm which represents
14 the community residents.

15 I have in my possession a letter from the
16 USEPA, and from the quote -- this is to Gene
17 Gillespie, the site manager. It remains the USEPA's
18 position that the existing contamination in Little
19 Beaver Creek is considered off site and is a threat
20 to human health and the environment.

21 For the last ten years, we have been
22 telling the community and the national groups that
23 we are heading in the direction of becoming a
24 national dump. We never heard the name until just
25 here lately, and the name for the dump is called

1 GNEP, Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. What part
2 of no doesn't the government understand? We don't
3 want a nuclear dump here in Piketon named GNEP or
4 any other name they put on it. GNEP will bring few
5 jobs.

6 I would like to show you a few pictures of
7 a pipe that goes straight from the plant to the
8 Scioto River. At the end of this pipe, they showed
9 that we have contamination in fish with radiation
10 and PCBs.

11 The USEPA letter that I hold stated that
12 the contamination in Little Beaver Creek is off
13 site. The last EPA meeting, it was told that one
14 community of residents have been told that the
15 contamination has spread to their property. This
16 property is close to the sleary wall that was built,
17 and also in the same area that my experts found
18 contamination.

19 MR. BROWN: You've got about one minute to
20 wrap up. Thanks.

21 MS. COLLEY: I'm sorry. I would like to
22 remind you that Piketon is one of the most
23 contaminated sites in the world because we recycled
24 reactor fuel from Hanford and West Valley, New York.

25 In 1999, PRESS was able to come forward

1 with documents that mentions the presence of
2 plutonium and neptunium in the processing of the
3 X-forth 05 building and the other buildings.
4 Workers at the Piketon site and other sites like
5 Hanford were being exposed to plutonium without our
6 knowledge. Piketon is one of the most contaminated
7 sites resulting from reprocessing of spent fuel from
8 West Valley, New York and other sites like Hanford.

9 Because of this process, the Energy
10 Employees Compensation Act was put in process.

11 MR. BROWN: Can you make just one more
12 point, please?

13 MS. COLLEY: Do we want to continue to
14 have to pay widows \$150,000 and condition to give
15 workers medical cards because we put them in harm's
16 way? These are Cold War heroes and they have been
17 treated like dirt. It took me 20 years to get this
18 medical card, and I just got it last month. Twenty
19 years. So who is going to help these new workers
20 and how long will it take them to get a medical
21 card?

22 MR. BROWN: Can you --

23 MS. COLLEY: GNEP plans to move the highly
24 radioactive waste from reactor sites around the
25 country and the world to one of 11 communities, most

1 likely Piketon. If this comes to pass, Piketon will
2 become a sacrifice zone. Businesses and jobs will
3 disappear rather than materializing.

4 MR. BROWN: You need --

5 MS. COLLEY: No one wants to live, work or
6 visit radioactive waste dumps. The cleanup of the
7 old gaseous diffusion plant that was promised to the
8 community will never occur if a high-level
9 radioactive waste dump is imposed on this site.

10 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Can you submit the
11 rest of that for the record?

12 MS. COLLEY: Yes.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

14 MS. COLLEY: The site will never be
15 cleaned up if we bring GNEP in here.

16 (Applause from audience.)

17 MR. BROWN: We are less than 20 percent
18 through the speakers. Again, I'll just ask for your
19 cooperation. If you have a longer statement, hit
20 the main points, you have got some time to review
21 it, and then submit the rest. The court reporter
22 will take that and it will be part of the record.

23 FROM FLOOR: I'm sorry, but this is a
24 community meeting, and everyone who is here has the
25 right to participate, and that means to hear what

1 other people have said.

2 MR. BROWN: That is precisely --

3 FROM FLOOR: If you want to limit talking
4 in meetings of yours behind closed doors, by all
5 means. This is not a behind-closed-doors thing that
6 you are controlling. This is a community meeting.

7 MR. BROWN: Ma'am, as I said, there are 60
8 people who have indicated an interest in speaking
9 and --

10 FROM FLOOR: That's right. We'll be here
11 all night.

12 FROM FLOOR: Let them speak.

13 FROM FLOOR: We're in no rush. Sounds
14 good to me.

15 FROM FLOOR: We have time.

16 FROM FLOOR: Give us the mic already.

17 MR. BROWN: We're going to have a
18 three-minute limit, and if we have time after we're
19 done, then --

20 FROM FLOOR: If who has time?

21 MR. BROWN: Next speaker.

22 FROM FLOOR: The plant has been here for
23 50 years. Why can't we stay an hour longer?

24 MR. BROWN: Henry Spitz.

25 HENRY SPITZ

1 commented as follows:

2 MR. SPITZ: My name is Henry Spitz, and
3 I'm a member of the faculty of the University of
4 Cincinnati College of Engineering. I've been very
5 heavily involved in the occupational and
6 environmental monitoring at the Fernald site, as
7 you've already heard, is now completely cleaned up,
8 or almost completely cleaned.

9 However, I want to express my support for
10 the nuclear fuel recycling and advanced reactor
11 facilities in Piketon. I believe that the GNEP
12 facility is important for the economic future of
13 Ohio and will provide high-quality and good-paying
14 jobs for the highly-skilled work force in the area.

15 GNEP is an essential program if the U.S.
16 is to become less dependent upon foreign sources of
17 energy. I strongly believe that nuclear energy is
18 safe, reliable and an environmentally sensible
19 source of electricity that produces no greenhouse
20 gases and has a minimal impact on the environment.

21 However, combusting fossil fuels, whether
22 for electricity or transportation, results in the
23 emission of fine particles of soot that we all
24 breathe and it leads directly to dangerous health
25 effects. Breathing this soot has been shown by

1 recent studies to increase the incidence of
2 cardiovascular disease and increase the incidence of
3 risk of death by 150 percent. That's nearly the
4 same rate as smoking.

5 In order to sustain a desired quality of
6 life and for the domestic economy to grow, the
7 United States needs a reliable source of low cost,
8 environmentally sensible energy. Nuclear energy
9 offers these features and enables the U.S. to be
10 energy independent and insensitive to the whims of
11 rogue nations that have used oil to promote
12 objectives that are not in our national interest.

13 Recycling is a reasonable approach to
14 dealing with spent nuclear fuel or any other
15 valuable resource, since part of the original value
16 of the resource can be recovered and reused. The
17 quantity of usable uranium in spent nuclear fuel is
18 almost 80 percent of the original value. So why
19 should we discard it? It should be recycled.

20 Yucca Mountain isn't ready. It won't be
21 ready. It's insufficient for even our present fuel
22 loads, our recycling loads and any future needs.

23 I support the construction and operation
24 of a nuclear fuel recycling and advanced reactor
25 facility at Piketon. Thank you.

1 (Applause from audience.)

2 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Tressie Hall is
3 next. She will be followed by Richard Denning and
4 Steve Carter.

5 TRESSIE HALL

6 commented as follows:

7 MS. HALL: My name is Tressie Hall, and I
8 live about a half a mile from the plant. I've been
9 there for 24 years.

10 FROM FLOOR: Get closer to the microphone.

11 MS. HALL: The last few months our group,
12 SONG, Southern Ohio Neighbors Group, have tried to
13 meet with the president with SODI, Randy Runyon.
14 Mr. Runyon would not return our calls or meet with
15 us. I have a letter here I would like to read from
16 SODI.

17 Dear Members, at the last meeting of the
18 Southern Ohio Diversified Initiative Board of
19 Directors, the board acted on one and passed a
20 resolution regarding your request to address the
21 members of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership
22 site evaluation process.

23 The resolution requests there be one
24 spokesman from your group to address the board for
25 ten minutes -- that's all the time they would give

1 us -- to share your concerns at the next regularly
2 scheduled meeting. The next regular meeting of the
3 board is Tuesday, October 31st, 2006.

4 I have a list of demands. We want Piketon
5 removed from the list of GNEP candidate sites.

6 FROM FLOOR: Yes.

7 MS. HALL: We want to terminate the GNEP
8 study contract with ePIFNI and seek reimbursement of
9 all allocated funds. We reject all proposals for
10 spent nuclear fuel at Piketon and terminate any
11 contracts now in force.

12 We want to reclassify the site for
13 long-term cleanup and return it to local ownership,
14 complete the treatment of on site waste and remove
15 it from the site as rapidly as possible. Create a
16 citizen advisory board for stakeholders at the Pike
17 County site immediately.

18 I do not want GNEP. Thank you.

19 (Applause from audience.)

20 MR. BROWN: Richard Denning, Steve Carter
21 and then Matthew White.

22 RICHARD DENNING

23 commented as follows:

24 MR. DENNING: I am Richard Denning, Chair
25 of the Nuclear Engineering Program at the Ohio State

1 University.

2 Our economy and lifestyle rely on the
3 availability of inexpensive energy. Even without
4 the threat of global warming, oil supply will peak
5 and begin its decline in the very near future, at a
6 time in which world-wide demand is rapidly
7 increasing. The decline of natural gas production
8 will follow shortly thereafter. We have large
9 reserves of coal, but it is not clear that carbon
10 dioxide sequestration from coal-fired generation
11 plants is economically viable or safe.

12 The only economically competitive
13 alternative to fossil fuels that does not produce
14 greenhouse gases is nuclear energy. Over the past
15 20 years, nuclear power has matured to become a
16 reliable, safe and economic source of energy. As
17 you have been told, 20 percent of our electricity is
18 produced by nuclear power.

19 New, passively safe nuclear power plant
20 designs are in the process of being certified by the
21 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. A rapid
22 expansion of the number of nuclear power plants must
23 be a major goal not only of the U.S. energy policy
24 but of the world's energy policy. Based on
25 licensing applications that are in preparation, the

1 NRC estimates that in the United States, 30 new
2 plant orders will be submitted over the next five
3 years. There are, however, barriers to the nuclear
4 renaissance that must be resolved if nuclear energy
5 is to play an important role in solving the world's
6 energy problems.

7 The GNEP program addresses two of those
8 issues. The first issue is proliferation of nuclear
9 weapon technology. Nearly every country is
10 considering the construction of nuclear power plants
11 as a step toward energy independence and global
12 environmental protection. The GNEP program would
13 enable non-weapon countries to have an assured
14 source of nuclear fuel without having to obtain
15 technologies that could be diverted to make nuclear
16 weapons.

17 Another barrier is the lack of a licensed
18 geologic repository. This is completely a
19 not-in-my-back-yard political issue. There is no
20 technical reason that would prevent nuclear waste
21 from being safely stored in the Yucca Mountain
22 repository. However, political barriers are just as
23 real as technical barriers. If implemented, GNEP
24 would dramatically decrease the demands on geologic
25 repositories while substantially improving the

1 efficiency with which we use our global resources of
2 uranium.

3 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

4 MR. DENNING: An environmental impact
5 statement will now be prepared that will consider
6 the use of the Piketon site, among competitive
7 alternatives, to construct GNEP facilities. There
8 are three new types of facilities that will
9 potentially be built here. The inventory of
10 radionuclides that would be associated with these
11 facilities is substantial. It is reasonable for the
12 public to ask what the associated risk would be from
13 the operational or accidental release of
14 radiological and other hazardous materials from
15 these facilities.

16 In the past, the record of environmental
17 protection and worker safety at this site has not
18 always been exemplary. However, the gaseous
19 diffusion plants were constructed and operated in a
20 period of time that is substantially different from
21 today. There was less known about the potential
22 effects from radiological and toxic materials, the
23 standards were less stringent and the federal
24 oversight was looser.

25 Based on my experience observing the

1 improvements that have occurred in the operation of
2 nuclear facilities in the U.S. over the last forty
3 years as a safety analyst and as a member of the
4 DOE's Advisory Committee on Nuclear Facility Safety
5 and the NRC's Advisory Committee on Reactor
6 Safeguards, I am convinced that any of the proposed
7 facilities can be and would be operated in a manner
8 that provides adequate protection of the
9 environment, the safety of the workers and the
10 safety of members of the public. Thank you.

11 (Applause from audience.)

12 MR. BROWN: Steve Carter, Matthew White
13 and Julie Murray.

14 STEVE CARTER

15 commented as follows:

16 MR. CARTER: My name is Steve Carter. I'm
17 the Economic Development Director in Scioto County.
18 I'm also a member of the Southern Ohio
19 Diversification Initiative.

20 FROM FLOOR: What?

21 MR. CARTER: I'm also a member of the
22 Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative, which is a
23 partner with ePIFNI, the Piketon Initiative For
24 Nuclear Independence, which forms the Southern Ohio
25 Nuclear Integration Cooperative, SONIC.

1 Our office is supportive of the continued
2 nuclear commercial presence in Southern Ohio to
3 preserve and create jobs for citizens in our area.
4 I'm also very supportive of a full, complete
5 decommissioning and decontamination of the GDP
6 plant, as well, which will also provide thousands of
7 jobs for our region.

8 For 50 years, uranium enrichment for
9 nuclear fuel has partially occurred at this plant.
10 We owe a debt of gratitude for the thousands of
11 workers who have played a major role in our nation's
12 national defense and energy security. Our office is
13 supportive of the Programmatic Environmental Impact
14 Statement.

15 Decades ago, back in the '50s, there was
16 major regional support for the existing Gaseous
17 Diffusion Plant. In the early '90s, Admiral
18 Watkins, Secretary of Energy, with over 2,500
19 citizens in support of AvLis, was down at Shawnee
20 State University. In the late '90s, over 600
21 supporters for the continuation of operations at the
22 Piketon site appeared in consultation with the Ohio
23 Environmental Protection Agency that was looking at
24 pulling their operating permits. In the early
25 2000s, major regional support for deployment of the

1 American Centrifuge Plant occurred.

2 Our office supports the detailed siting
3 study. Question, does our site have the
4 characteristics to support the deployment of a
5 nuclear fuel rod recycling facility and advanced
6 recycling reactor? I'm supportive of the NRC, not
7 the DOE to license and regulate these facilities if
8 they occur.

9 I would like to see plans for more
10 adequate security at the plant site. I am
11 supportive of finding adequate storage off site for
12 any remaining waste material for the recycling
13 reactor.

14 MR. BROWN: One minute.

15 MR. CARTER: I, too, do not want this area
16 to be a nuclear fuel waste dump, and I don't think
17 it will.

18 I am supportive of the reuse of recycled
19 nuclear fuel rods to generate electricity for the
20 region. Our office is also supportive of the
21 International Nuclear Nonproliferation that this
22 recycling process will encourage.

23 Most importantly, I'm supportive of the
24 detailed siting study process being detected by
25 SONIC to determine if we have the site

1 characteristics for these two facilities, and if
2 possible to determine reasonably if we wish to
3 proceed or not in having deployment of these
4 facilities sited here. I do believe we'll have that
5 opportunity. Thank you.

6 (Applause from audience.)

7 MR. BROWN: Matthew White, Julie Murray
8 and then Ivan Maldonado.

9 MATTHEW WHITE

10 commented as follows:

11 MR. WHITE: Thank you. My name is Matt
12 White. I'm with Edison Welding Institute, one of
13 the seven Edison Technology Centers that are located
14 around the state. We provide a variety, with all
15 the other centers, of product development and
16 innovation services to help technology-based
17 businesses. As an example of that, we recently
18 worked with USEC on welding aluminum tubing on the
19 lead cascade for the American Centrifuge Program
20 here in Piketon. In that effort, we developed
21 optimized procedures for automated welding, then our
22 manufacturing lab then transfers them down to USEC
23 and the contractors for use on the centrifuge
24 project.

25 We met recently with the Piketon

1 initiative regarding the siting study for the
2 Portsmouth facilities to host GNEP, and we were
3 asked to comment briefly at this hearing on the
4 technology infrastructure within the state that
5 might be available to support the development
6 effort, if it's awarded, and help assure
7 effectiveness and safety of the facility.

8 Prime research has shown that the
9 approaches is to separate uranium from spent fuel at
10 a level that would allow recyclables to exist, but
11 in order to show those processes can be scaled up to
12 full production rates, you not only must demonstrate
13 that processes for GNEP can incorporate from a
14 process plant, but that you can operate them in
15 commercial levels as well.

16 To achieve those goals, GNEP proposed a
17 government-industry partnership to involve industry
18 earlier in the process and identify barriers to full
19 implementation earlier, with a minimal reliance on
20 building interim facilities. That way you can
21 reduce overall costs and come to a more viable
22 solution without significantly increasing any risk.

23 To realize those types of advantages, the
24 state where the project is sited will have to align
25 technology, educational and industrial resources or

1 industrial resources and coordinate them with the
2 national labs and the DOE.

3 Ohio has a long-term commitment to
4 innovation and has a lot of the advanced
5 manufacturing development infrastructure to rapidly
6 commercialize those developments.

7 We're a state that makes things and we
8 make them well, everything from aircraft engines to
9 process plants to specialty materials to medical
10 devices. We have evolved a world-class network of
11 technological centers of excellence that support the
12 ability of Ohio's industry to successfully deliver
13 to customers and it's stakeholders.

14 MR. BROWN: One minute.

15 MR. WHITE: We have over 70 four-year
16 institutions providing education to students doing
17 over two billion dollars worth of research a year,
18 graduating 6,000 engineering graduates and a number
19 of not for profit research institutions, and in
20 2002, launched the Third Frontier Program which is
21 investing over 1.6 billion dollars in additional
22 areas, including advanced manufacturing, power and
23 propulsion.

24 Taking together those resources and the
25 companies they support, we're providing a unique

1 network of resources that can be rapidly deployed to
2 work with the government to provide a road map that
3 can resolve those technical uncertainties, take
4 advantage of the public and private resources here
5 in Ohio to minimize that program's investment and
6 then result in a timely development of a safe and
7 viable commercial operation that still sustains the
8 public's goals.

9 The final format obviously has to be
10 determined by the end of this study and those issues
11 need to be addressed. We are available to assist
12 the Piketon community through the study process and
13 the reported delivery of those services from the
14 community to support the local efforts to support
15 the GNEP facility, should the community decide it be
16 built.

17 Thanks for the opportunity of addressing
18 you.

19 (Applause from audience.)

20 MR. BROWN: Julie Murray, Ivan Maldonado
21 and then John Christenson.

22 JULIE MURRAY

23 commented as follows:

24 MS. MURRAY: Julie Murray, citizen and
25 voter in southwestern Ohio.

1 I just have one comment after listening to
2 what I've heard tonight, and that is that it seems
3 disingenuous to me to have an informational meeting
4 where no questions and answers can be asked and no
5 dialogue really happens. This polarizes people in
6 to two separate camps and never creates community.

7 (Applause from audience.)

8 IVAN MALDONADO

9 commented as follows:

10 MR. MALDONADO: Good evening. My name is
11 Ivan Maldonado. I'm an Associate Professor of
12 Nuclear Engineering at the University of Cincinnati.

13 After hearing some of the comments, I
14 believe one of my duties beyond educating some of
15 your children at the University of Cincinnati about
16 the specifics of nuclear engineering and nuclear
17 technology, I speak to parents quite frequently. So
18 I just want to make you aware of the fact that Ohio
19 State University and the University of Cincinnati
20 both have nuclear engineering programs that are
21 quite successful.

22 I've been involved with the nuclear
23 industry for almost 20 years in the Knolls Atomic
24 Nuclear Lab at Schenectady, New York where the Navy
25 has been operating and developing more than 80

1 nuclear reactors over the past 40 or so years,
2 including a liquid metal cooled reactor that was the
3 second nuclear submarine in this country. The
4 technology regarding reprocessing and recycling is
5 nothing new. It's been available and used in France
6 for many, many years, 30 plus years. So one of my
7 duties, too, is to let you know that this is not
8 rocket science science.

9 I want to tell you, as you have heard
10 before, there are about 103 operating nuclear power
11 plants in this country. We expect the number to
12 double or more in the U.S. and the world over the
13 next 50 or so years, and therefore it's crucial that
14 we understand that recycling is a very very
15 important piece of this operation.

16 The reactors that will use the recycled
17 material are fast reactors, fast neutrons that would
18 be used to destroy long-lived radioisotopes, and the
19 remaining nuclear waste is intended to be sent to a
20 facility such as Yucca Mountain. I hear the
21 perception that the waste is going to come here and
22 stay here, and I'm here to tell you that I don't
23 believe that to be the case. I believe that the
24 volume of the waste will be reduced and the true
25 waste will be sent to Yucca Mountain. That's all I

1 have to say today.

2 (Applause from audience.)

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. John Christenson,
4 then he will be followed by Steve Moore and then
5 Jennifer Chandler.

6 JOHN CHRISTENSON

7 commented as follows:

8 MR. CHRISTENSON: Again, I have a
9 difficult act to follow. I'm also a member of the
10 faculty and the director of the nuclear and
11 radiological engineering program at the University
12 of Cincinnati.

13 I have been involved in nuclear energy
14 technology for most of my professional career. A
15 great deal of that has been at the University of
16 Cincinnati, but it has also been at a operating
17 nuclear power plant during the time it was starting
18 up, Prairie Island in Minnesota.

19 In my professional opinion, I think
20 Piketon would be an excellent location for a GNEP
21 facility, and I share the views of my colleagues
22 that such a facility can be operated safely. It
23 would not -- underline, it would not be, in my
24 opinion, a nuclear waste dump, but rather would make
25 this world and the United States a safer place to

1 live.

2 Now, having said that, let me say that I
3 greatly respect the depth of convictions of the
4 people in the surrounding community. I live in
5 Cincinnati, and that is somewhat further from
6 Piketon than people that have adjacent farms. But
7 nonetheless, I have lived in Cincinnati and I have
8 worked in a nuclear power plant, and in my
9 experience, those plants and nuclear power
10 technology is -- this is not just my own view, this
11 is the view of people that have worked at both
12 fossil plants and nuclear plants. Nuclear plants
13 are cleaner, they are safer and they are better
14 places to work. I think the same thing would be
15 true here with the advanced technology that has been
16 developed. Thank you.

17 FROM FLOOR: Too bad we can't ask you a
18 question.

19 MR. BROWN: Excuse me?

20 FROM FLOOR: It's just too bad, because
21 maybe then some of the people who have fears about
22 such would be able to get a better understanding.

23 MR. BROWN: You could go talk to --

24 FROM FLOOR: That won't help the matter.

25 MR. BROWN: Steve Moore, Jennifer Chandler

1 and Chris Hanners.

2 STEVE MOORE

3 commented as follows:

4 MR. MOORE: My name is Steve Moore. I'm
5 not the professor of anything, but I am the
6 president and CEO of a local business called Western
7 Advantage, and I have been part of the process here
8 to look at this study.

9 I do want to say that I do support the
10 study. I support this from the standpoint that new
11 expenditure fuel is a real issue that is facing the
12 nation, and I think that there's some excellent
13 resources here, both infrastructure and an extremely
14 qualified and talented work force that could help be
15 part of the solution.

16 I don't support anything that results in
17 the long-term disposal of nuclear waste at the site,
18 and I don't think any of us do. But I do support
19 the study and I do thank DOE for the opportunity to
20 speak. I just think there are an awful lot of very
21 highly talented people in this area who could help
22 solve this national problem. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: Jennifer Chandler, Chris

1 Hanners will follow and then Robert Foster.

2 JENNIFER CHANDLER

3 commented as follows:

4 MS. CHANDLER: My name is Jennifer
5 Chandler. I have lived here my entire life and
6 raised my family here as well. I worked five years
7 at the A-Plant and worked five years for SODI, and
8 now I am the community and economic director for
9 Pike County.

10 I would like to let you all know that for
11 over 50 years, Pike County has supported the federal
12 government's defense, energy and environmental
13 restoration missions at the U.S. DOE Pike County
14 site. As U.S. DOE began downsizing and redefining
15 its mission in the mid '90s, Pike County officials
16 and regional community leaders became actively
17 involved in the creation of the community reuse
18 organization known as SODI. SODI is a nonprofit
19 organization comprised of a 15-member board
20 representing Pike, Scioto, Ross and Jackson
21 Counties.

22 In 1997, this board began implementing the
23 Community Transition Plan, which is put together by
24 a public process and public meetings a lot like
25 this. And Community Transition Plan contains a

1 series of initiatives that were designed to
2 diversify the economy, create high-wage jobs,
3 strengthen the tax base and improve the quality of
4 life in the four-county impact area. One of those
5 initiatives is this building and one of those
6 initiatives is reindustrialization or redevelopment
7 of the U.S. DOE site.

8 Pike County's goal was then and is today
9 to redevelop this site in a way that will maintain
10 and add to the highly skilled work force, which
11 includes chemists, engineers, environmental
12 scientists and safety experts, and also to utilize
13 the vast infrastructure that still exists on the
14 3,700 acre site, such as the capacity to provide 40
15 million gallons of raw water a day and also the
16 network of high voltage transmission lines and
17 substations, just to mention a few. We have many
18 more.

19 MR. BROWN: You have a minute left.

20 MS. CHANDLER: Over the last several
21 years, we worked to support the redevelopment of the
22 site, and today we are still working to support
23 redevelopment of the site. We believe that one of
24 the best ways to strengthen our economy is to
25 redevelop the site. We believe also that

1 redevelopment will require major cleanup efforts.
2 We do not want our site to be turned into a nuclear
3 dump. We want productive reuse of our site. We're
4 proud of our site and we're proud of the people that
5 work there.

6 We do believe that the study will also
7 find -- this evaluation will find that we have a
8 wonderful regulatory group in the Ohio EPA and we
9 trust that they will be a major player in this
10 process.

11 Above all, we're confident that the site
12 evaluation will accurately, with all of the people
13 here, show that Pike County is a place where
14 business and industry can prosper and energy and
15 research and new technology will thrive. Thank you
16 very much.

17 (Applause from floor.)

18 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Robert Foster.
19 Robert will be followed by John Hemmings and then
20 Jeff Sinnard.

21 ROBERT FOSTER

22 commented as follows:

23 MR. FOSTER: Hello, my name is Bob Foster.
24 I'm the President of the First National Bank in
25 Waverly and have been a life-long resident of Pike

1 County.

2 I have followed the project discussed here
3 tonight for several months and I would like to offer
4 two perspectives that I feel are relevant to
5 tonight's hearing.

6 First of all, I grew up here and am
7 fortunate enough to have raised my family in Pike
8 County. Secondly, as a businessman in Southern
9 Ohio, I know firsthand the impact of the operations
10 that the DOE plant have on our economy. This
11 community has always been -- supported new missions
12 that fit the regional vision of sustainable
13 development and provide good living wage jobs.

14 I believe the GNEP project holds great
15 possibility for the regional economy and that it
16 presents a tremendous opportunity for the health and
17 welfare of our community. If, after careful
18 evaluation, the GNEP project can be implemented in a
19 safe manner, I wholeheartedly support the
20 development in Piketon.

21 (Applause from audience.)

22 MR. BROWN: John Hemmings, Jeff Sinnard
23 and Rosie Picklesimer.

24 JOHN HEMMINGS

25 commented as follows:

1 MR. HEMMINGS: I'm John Hemmings. I'm the
2 Assistant Director with Ohio Valley Regional
3 Development Mission in Waverly, Ohio. I'm a Scioto
4 County native, resident, educated and raised there,
5 and I work here in Pike County now, for ten years,
6 in fact.

7 I do support the GNEP study. I think we
8 need to look at the possibility for the use of the
9 site. If it's not good for the site, then I think
10 that will be decided through the study. I think
11 that's what we will find out through this process,
12 so I certainly support that.

13 I did have the privilege last week to
14 attend a renewable energy conference in Columbus and
15 heard several Ohio State University, Texas A&M
16 University engineers and economists speak about
17 renewable energy. One thing I left that conference
18 with was the fact that with renewable energy -- I
19 kept waiting on them to tell me what the solution is
20 with renewable energy is. We hear so much about it.

21 The thing finally they said, and I was
22 glad somebody said it, was that there's no silver
23 bullet. There's not one answer when we look at our
24 energy issues here in the United States or in the
25 world. So in my mind, keeping the option open for

1 nuclear energy as well as renewable energy and
2 traditional sources of energy are still necessary.

3 With that, I thank you for your time this
4 evening.

5 (Applause from audience.)

6 MR. BROWN: Jeff Sinnard, Rosie
7 Picklesimer will be next and Randy Basham.

8 JEFF SINNARD

9 commented as follows:

10 MR. SINNARD: Thank you. My name is Jeff
11 Sinnard. I didn't come here tonight to endorse or
12 condemn the plan. Since I don't live in this
13 area -- I live in Anderson Township in Hamilton
14 County -- it might be a little bit overreaching for
15 me to make a pronouncement from here. But I should
16 say that living down river and on the major
17 transportation hubs that would serve this facility
18 gives me some right, I think, to speak. I did
19 really come to support the people who live and work
20 in this area. I wanted to ask a few questions.

21 First, let me say that this sounds great
22 and I would really like to trust everybody that's
23 telling us these wonderful stories, I'd really like
24 to, but I have to ask myself and I have to ask some
25 of you folks tonight, are the promises of the people

1 of Pike County as hollow as the promises made to the
2 veterans at Walter Reed?

3 (Applause from audience.)

4 MR. SINNARD: If, God forbid, something
5 goes wrong, are your efforts going to be as feeble
6 as FEMA's efforts after Hurricane Katrina?

7 (Applause from audience.)

8 MR. SINNARD: Just as the recently
9 revealed treatment of our military veterans is
10 unacceptable, it would be unacceptable to mistreat
11 the workers and their families dependant on the
12 continuing nuclear programs in Piketon and Pike
13 County. The people of this community are veterans
14 of the Cold War. They have earned the opportunity
15 to benefit from real programs that turn swords into
16 plowshares.

17 The GNEP program, as proposed by President
18 Bush, literally, on the website, promises peace and
19 prosperity, a goal I wholeheartedly support. I pray
20 that you can deliver on this promise. Unfortunately
21 the recent track record does not bode well for
22 peace. And prosperity has yet to return to our part
23 of Ohio.

24 Thank you for the opportunity to speak.
25 Good luck to you all. But remember good luck is not

1 a substitute for good planning. Thank you.

2 (Applause from audience.)

3 MR. BROWN: Rosie Picklesimer, Randy
4 Basham and then Lee Blackburn.

5 ROSIE PICKLESIMER

6 commented as follows:

7 MS. PICKLESIMER: Hi. My name is Rosie
8 Picklesimer. I'm a resident of Scioto County and I
9 work with the work force programs.

10 I am in favor of the GNEP study. I think
11 there's a potential to create thousands of safe jobs
12 and to be able to utilize the skills in our current
13 labor market and build upon our regional economy.
14 Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

16 (Applause from audience.)

17 MR. BROWN: Randy Basham, Lee Blackburn
18 and then Robert Childers.

19 RANDY BASHAM

20 commented as follows:

21 MR. BASHAM: My name is Randy Basham. I
22 am the United Steel Workers of America International
23 representative for the workers at the Piketon
24 facility. Some of you know there was a merger
25 between PACE and the United Steel Workers, and now

1 the employees there are United Steel Worker members.
2 I'm here tonight to address the union perspective on
3 GNEP.

4 The United Steel Workers stand strong with
5 the workers in the community on the GNEP project on
6 the study. We want to show and believe that it
7 clearly was not a mistake over 50 years ago to put
8 this facility here. We clearly believe after all
9 the study is done and the footprint and maps that
10 are laid out from the facility overseas in France,
11 that was toured by some of the local people and
12 local union members, that we believe that it will
13 come to fruits and prove that these could become
14 good paying jobs here in Southern Ohio.

15 We know that the government will build
16 this facility somewhere. It will be maybe out west,
17 maybe in the northeast. It could be here, it could
18 be there. But I'll guarantee you, with our educated
19 work force in Southern Ohio, our children and
20 grandchildren will follow those jobs wherever they
21 go to try to get them. They will build homes in
22 those communities and raise your grandchildren
23 there, and you will go visit them, like we have done
24 so many times in the past.

25 So we would like to see this study come to

1 fruits and prove to the community that it can be a
2 safe place built by the best construction-trade
3 employees in Southern Ohio and operated by some of
4 the best educated and trained members in Local 689.
5 Thank you.

6 (Applause from audience.)

7 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Lee Blackburn,
8 Robert Childers then Jeffrey Wilson.

9 LEE BLACKBURN

10 commented as follows:

11 MR. BLACKBURN: Good evening. My name is
12 Lee Blackburn. I came here to get answers to
13 questions, but I was told that I had to go in to
14 another room to get those answers. I have a lot of
15 questions about what's being proposed here, what is
16 the timeline, who is going to benefit. I have heard
17 a lot of support from individuals who have vested
18 interest, from professors a hundred miles away in
19 Cincinnati or 75 miles up the road from Ohio State,
20 but I have heard very little support from those
21 individuals who are just working here.

22 I would suggest that instead of bringing
23 more nuclear waste here, we clean up this site. The
24 site needs to be cleaned up. It's contaminated.

25 All I can say is that if the late start,

1 the small room and the poor organization is any
2 indication of what we can expect if they bring more
3 nuclear waste here, all I can say is God help us
4 all.

5 (Applause from audience.)

6 MR. BROWN: Robert Childers, Jeffrey
7 Wilson and then C.W. Sheward.

8 ROBERT CHILDERS

9 commented as follows:

10 MR. CHILDERS: My name is Bob Childers. I
11 retired from the plant in January of 1990, after
12 working there for 36-and-a-half years. I have been
13 retired for 17 years.

14 I was hired in July of 1953, and I saw the
15 plant build up from the foundations. The first time
16 I ever went up there, I come down Pike Avenue, an
17 old dusty road, and the contractors were building
18 the foundations for all of the buildings.

19 I would like to say that the plant was
20 started up by some very qualified employees, and I
21 was part of that class that first started it up in
22 1953. We went on the line in 1954.

23 As a member of the community, I would
24 think that this facility would greatly enhance our
25 job forces, and I fully support it. Thank you.

1 (Applause from audience.)

2 MR. BROWN: Jeffrey Wilson, C.W. Sheward
3 and then Blain Beekman.

4 JEFFREY WILSON

5 commented as follows:

6 MR. WILSON: My name is Jeffrey Wilson. I
7 live in Williamsburg, Ohio, and I own property in
8 local -- adjacent to Adams County.

9 I first became aware of all of the new
10 plans for development of this facility about a year
11 ago when I received a copy of the USEC Environmental
12 Review. I saw USEC skirt those environmental review
13 processes through the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
14 You can bet that this same thing is going to happen
15 here. They did not follow the proper procedures
16 through that process and already, it looks like,
17 they are jumping through and avoiding going through
18 the proper process here.

19 What I would say is, any proposal that is
20 considering nuclear waste storage or processing or
21 reprocessing at this Piketon facility is extremely
22 irresponsible, no matter what the economic impact
23 may be on the local community. If the federal
24 government scientists couldn't get past safety
25 issues to bury this waste under a mountain in a

1 desert away from population centers out in Yucca
2 Mountain in Utah, what makes anybody in this room
3 think that they can guarantee your safety when this
4 is sitting right by a river on top of an aquifer in
5 which that river is going to flow into the Ohio,
6 flow into the Mississippi and literally affect the
7 drinking water of millions of people in this
8 country. It's extremely irresponsible. You can
9 just look at -- within the first 75 miles, there are
10 six major population centers that could be affected
11 by this proposal.

12 I think that it's hugely expensive, and
13 that's your tax dollars at work. You should have a
14 say in where those tax dollars go. Instead of
15 pouring it in to this irresponsible project, I think
16 that they should put the money in to research, into
17 the fusion process or renewable resources, but
18 especially to clean up the site after 50 years of
19 wrecking it.

20 MR. BROWN: You've got one minute.

21 MR. WILSON: Okay. There will be no
22 economic benefits for dead people.

23 (Applause from audience.)

24 MR. WILSON: One tornado accident and
25 you're going to have an environmental catastrophe

1 like this country has not seen before.

2 FROM FLOOR: Chernobyl.

3 (Applause from audience.)

4 MR. BROWN: C.W. Sheward, Blane Beekman
5 and Joyce Asfour.

6 C.W. SHEWARD

7 commented as follows:

8 MR. SHEWARD: I'll serve to get us back on
9 schedule perhaps. My name is Buck Sheward. I've
10 worked at the plant for 31 years. So if you've been
11 waiting to see someone who has worked here a long
12 time, you're looking at him now.

13 I was born and raised in Jackson County
14 over between Beaver and Jackson. I worked at the
15 plant, like I said, for 31 years. My daughter
16 worked here and my son-in-law worked at the plant,
17 and I hope that my grandchildren have the
18 opportunity to work at the plant if they want to. I
19 have absolutely no concern if they do that.

20 I fully support the study for the siting
21 of the GNEP initiative and I believe -- I really
22 believe that when that study is complete, that it
23 will be proven what I know is true, that the work
24 force here and the facilities that we have are quite
25 capable of managing this project very successfully.

1 As a manager of production and maintenance
2 and security and several other programs at the plant
3 over 31 years, I've had the opportunity to visit the
4 Titan Assembly Plant in Colorado, the Titan Alliance
5 Facility at Cape Canaveral, the agent's plant run
6 for the U.S. Navy in Pennsylvania and several
7 nuclear reactors, mainly on the east coast. I was
8 able to contrast and compare the work force there at
9 those sites with the work force here, and I can tell
10 you without any -- without any reservation, that we
11 have a work force that's equal to or superior to any
12 I've seen around the country. We have the people
13 and the site, and I believe that when this study is
14 complete, it will prove what I know to be true, that
15 this is the -- a proper place for a GNEP facility.
16 Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

18 (Applause from audience.)

19 MR. BROWN: Blaine Beekman, Joyce Asfour
20 and Linda Busken Jergens.

21 BLAINE BEEKMAN

22 commented as follows:

23 MR. BEEKMAN: I'm Blaine Beekman. I'm the
24 Executive Director of the Pike County Chamber of
25 Commerce. At the last board meeting, my board

1 passed a resolution and support with going ahead
2 with this study. And if, in fact, when the study
3 returns and it shows that this will have a positive
4 effect on the community with no environmental
5 concerns, we certainly will support it.

6 Three years ago, when we were going in the
7 hearings on the centrifuge, the community presented
8 9,000 letters of community support from
9 individuals --

10 FROM FLOOR: Can we see those letters?

11 MR. BEEKMAN: They have been given to
12 USEC. You know that, ma'am. Come on, Tress.

13 FROM FLOOR: We would.

14 MR. BEEKMAN: Anyway, this is where -- the
15 one concern that I think we have is that when it
16 comes time to choose among those 11 sites, we won't
17 be able to mount the same type of public relations
18 campaigns that the people are in some of these other
19 sites. We have seen issues where we knew our site
20 was just as good, but we simply didn't have the
21 voice either politically or whatever.

22 So the other thing we would ask is if, in
23 fact, when this report comes back and it comes back
24 positive, we would really like to ask you all to be
25 sure that our site is considered fairly as opposed

1 to all the political influence that will be brought
2 in other places. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

4 (Applause from audience.)

5 MR. BROWN: Joyce Asfour, Linda Busken
6 Jergens will follow her and then Joe Griffith.

7 JOYCE ASFOUR

8 commented as follows:

9 MS. ASFOUR: Hello. I'm Joyce Asfour, and
10 I'm a citizen of Southern Ohio, and I thank you for
11 this opportunity to present my thoughts.

12 I'm very concerned about the lack of
13 living wage jobs in Southern Ohio, which includes
14 Pike County. It's one of the reasons why your
15 groups here have proposed this new use for Piketon.
16 I'm more concerned, however, that Piketon is not a
17 suitable site to store or reprocess spent nuclear
18 fuel until it can be moved to a geologically
19 appropriate repository.

20 First of all, it seems to me illogical to
21 consider that when many of the proposed geologic
22 repository sites are in states that have banned the
23 importation of high-level waste, like Utah, Nevada,
24 New Mexico, all those places that are dry and desert
25 and might be considered. I don't think they are

1 safe either, as one of the other speakers pointed
2 out.

3 It seems to me highly unlikely that this
4 waste will ever get out of Piketon. It will be
5 stuck here because of that fact.

6 Piketon is, itself, very unsuited for a
7 geologic repository, since it's directly over a
8 large aquifer, which feeds not only Piketon and Pike
9 County but other areas of Ohio.

10 The area has been a victim of unkept
11 promises before. The Piketon facility was abandoned
12 and still needs to be cleaned up, as has also been
13 pointed out by others. A cleanup effort could
14 supply the good jobs and the vibrant economy that
15 Pike County longs for. The area has major
16 prehistoric sites that could be developed in to
17 tourism, which could also create jobs.

18 MR. BROWN: About a minute left.

19 MS. ASFOUR: But lastly, many citizens of
20 Southern Ohio and of the whole United States believe
21 contrary to the speakers from the DOE, that nuclear
22 energy has too many very serious problems and there
23 are other safer energy sources that can be developed
24 like the solar and wind with a lot less cost.
25 Because all of those research process things that

1 they were mentioning in their presentation are going
2 to cost a lot of money, take a lot of time and it's
3 going to be a long time before it's safe to have
4 that process here.

5 (Applause from audience.)

6 MR. BROWN: Linda Busken Jergens, Joe
7 Griffith then Nick Grilli.

8 LINDA BUSKEN JERGENS

9 commented as follows:

10 MS. BUSKEN JERGENS: Thank you. I'm Linda
11 Busken Jergens from Cincinnati. I just have a
12 couple of observations.

13 There's some comments I've heard tonight
14 that fall deeply in to my body and my heart. One is
15 a victim of unkept promises. A victim of unkept
16 promises. Why do we think this will be different?
17 Why do you think this will be different?

18 Also, someone mentioned a tornado. I
19 would like to mention the earthquake of 1811 in
20 Missouri. Many do not know this, the Madrid
21 earthquake. The largest ever in the recorded
22 history of our country. No one knew it was coming.

23 What happens? We sit here near the
24 Humboldt fault. What happens? I watched the World
25 Trade Center being constructed brick by brick, story

1 by story over years. I saw in a flash of creative
2 terrorism it tumble. Are we creating here a target
3 for terrorism? This is our state, our decision, our
4 children's future. Thank you.

5 (Applause from audience.)

6 MR. BROWN: Joe Griffith and then Nick
7 Grilli. After Nick Grilli, Jim Morgan.

8 D. JOE GROFFITH

9 commented as follows:

10 MR. GRIFFITH: My name is Joe Griffith. I
11 believe I'm the first lawyer to speak tonight. What
12 would a public meeting be without a lawyer? I am
13 counsel for the Southern Ohio Neighbors Group. My
14 client has asked me to point out some very serious
15 problems with how we even got here tonight.

16 One of the conditions precedent for this
17 application to even be considered is that the
18 applicant must have demonstrated community support
19 for the project. Southern Ohio Neighbors Group
20 submits that there is insufficient community support
21 for this application even to be considered.

22 Throughout this process, Southern Ohio
23 Neighbors Group has requested to see the application
24 to prove that there's community support, but despite
25 repeated requests, the requests to review the

1 application have been denied. We would submit to
2 this body that this application does not have the
3 requisite community support and it should not be
4 considered.

5 FROM FLOOR: That's right.

6 (Applause from audience.)

7 MR. GRIFFITH: This project involves the
8 storage or the recycling of a very dangerous
9 material. To get a community to support that, you
10 have to have trust and you have to have trust in the
11 process. How can a community expect to have trust
12 in the process when there are secret meetings which
13 submit a secret application which purports to
14 represent community support which does not exist?

15 SONG is a coalition of property owners in
16 the area that is prepared to act as a watch dog to
17 make sure that the trust that the public deserves is
18 restored. SONG as an entity is prepared to initiate
19 litigation in the event that the trust that is
20 expected and demanded is not lived up to.

21 Now, there's been some comments about
22 nuclear energy being safe, and I'm not here to
23 debate that. What I do know is that there are ten
24 other sites that may, indeed, have appropriate
25 community support.

1 MR. BROWN: About a minute left.

2 MR. GRIFFITH: And if those sites do
3 demonstrate that they have community support, then
4 that's where this project should go. Because there
5 are several things that should be considered, beyond
6 the fact that you shouldn't have even considered the
7 application because there's not sufficient support.
8 There is a large aquifer beneath the area that
9 serves millions of citizens.

10 There has not been sufficient
11 demonstration of the number of jobs that the project
12 would offer the community. The community should
13 have been offered the opportunity to sit down before
14 the application was ever submitted, here's what the
15 technology is, here's what the risks are, here's
16 what the benefits are. That's never been done, this
17 application has been submitted and now it's beyond
18 this community's control to be able to say anything,
19 other than to participate in these meetings. Here
20 we are in a cramped room, we have a couple minutes
21 to speak and it's completely insufficient. This
22 community deserves better.

23 We would respectfully request that this
24 application be removed from consideration and that
25 this project go somewhere else. Thank you.

1 (Applause from audience.)

2 MR. BROWN: Nick Grilli, then Jim Morgan
3 will follow Nick and then Teresa Mahan.

4 NICK GRILLI

5 commented as follows:

6 MR. GRILLI: Hello. My name is Nick
7 Grilli. I'm also an attorney that represents the
8 Southern Ohio Neighbors Group. I just want to
9 highlight a couple of the comments that Mr. Griffith
10 had just stated.

11 Southern Ohio Neighbors Group, SONG,
12 absolutely opposes the GNEP detailed site study of
13 the Portsmouth facility. As counsel for SONG, we
14 are deeply troubled by the serious issues that have
15 existed during the GNEP application process,
16 including the inaccurate public consensus regarding
17 the application and the continuing nondisclosure of
18 the GNEP application.

19 SONG demands that the Piketon facility not
20 be considered a potential GNEP facility, that it be
21 dedicated to environmental cleanup, historic
22 reservation and nonnuclear and nonhazardous
23 industries. Thank you.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: Jim Morgan, Teresa Mahan and

1 then Naomi Stoehr.

2 JIM MORGAN

3 commented as follows:

4 MR. MORGAN: Thank you. My name is Jim
5 Morgan. I am the program manager, and I work for
6 ePIFNI.

7 I worked for 32 years at the Piketon
8 facility, starting as a cooperative education
9 student in 1969. The opportunity to work at that
10 facility while attending college afforded me the
11 opportunity to achieve a college degree that I would
12 never have realized without being able to enjoy that
13 working relationship at Piketon.

14 I'm going to do something really strange.
15 I'm going to comment into the scoping process. As
16 the individual responsible for leading the analysis
17 of the licensing regulatory and permitting processes
18 associated with these facilities, I have two
19 comments that I would like to submit as part of the
20 scoping process.

21 SONIC, in doing our homework and trying to
22 understand these processes, we visited the La Hogue
23 facility in France in October of last year.
24 Realizing that we were going to be looking at the
25 permitting and licensing and regulatory processes

1 when we went there, I was particularly interested in
2 understanding how facilities were regulatory
3 licensed in France, having been through the NRC
4 process myself with the lead cascade.

5 What we saw was a regulatory licensing
6 process very similar to the way EPA monitors
7 facilities in this country, and very similar to the
8 way that the NRC licenses and monitors facilities.
9 That should not be surprising since the NRC and the
10 French regulatory agencies work closely together in
11 developing processes and techniques.

12 We observed very safe, clean facilities.
13 We met with members of the local community from the
14 dairy industries and the fishing industry that are
15 very comfortable with their working relationship at
16 La Hogue.

17 So the first comment I submit is that to
18 the scoping process, I think it is a key ingredient
19 to this process that all the facilities being
20 deployed as part of the GNEP initiative be regulated
21 by the NRC.

22 MR. BROWN: You've got a minute left.

23 MR. MORGAN: My second comment involves
24 the opportunity for educational and technology
25 advancements in the United States. I think as part

1 of the siting criteria and the evaluation -- as you
2 look at your siting and evaluation for capabilities
3 of the site, I think it's key that you evaluate the
4 potential that exists within the state to meet the
5 educational and technological training requirements
6 of these highly technical facilities in order to
7 insure that you have the capability to train and
8 provide the work force and the educated personnel
9 and well-trained personnel necessary for the
10 operation. I thank you for your time and
11 consideration.

12 (Applause from audience.)

13 MR. BROWN: Teresa Mahan, Naomi Stoehr and
14 Dan Minter.

15 TERESA MAHAN

16 commented as follows:

17 MS. MAHAN: Hi. I'm Teresa Mahan. I'm a
18 resident near Pike County, near the Beaver area. I
19 manage the apartments there. I'm a mother and a
20 grandmother.

21 I'm also a member of SONG, the Southern
22 Ohio Neighbors Group and have helped circulate
23 petitions against this initiative. I have found
24 great support in the petitions, that people do not
25 want this. In fact, the only people I found who did

1 not sign were people who currently worked at the
2 A-Plant. I even had one of them say, "Well, I'm
3 going to retire next year. Come back then and I'll
4 sign it."

5 You know, I'm very disappointed that we
6 weren't giving the opportunity to ask questions. I
7 do have to wonder about putting all the nuclear
8 waste in one area.

9 What about the terrorists? Where does
10 that put us on the terrorist hit list? You guys are
11 going to get thank you letters from the terrorists
12 for how easy you're making their job.

13 I look at this as a mother and
14 grandmother. This is like, you know, giving a child
15 a paint set and you go out of the room and you come
16 back in and there's paint all over the floor and the
17 ceiling and everywhere. And when you ask them about
18 it, oh, it was an accident, it was an accident.
19 Okay. Well, clean it up, you're still responsible.
20 You come back and they haven't cleaned it up. The
21 only thing they do is ask for another paint set. Do
22 we give them another paint set? No, we don't give
23 them another paint set. We say, clean it up. Take
24 responsibility for what you've done.

25 This makes no sense to me. I mean, this

1 just seems like commonsense. I'm sorry, but I can't
2 support this. Please take it somewhere else.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

4 (Applause from audience.)

5 MR. BROWN: Naomi Stoehr will be followed
6 by Dan Minter and then Steve Martin.

7 NAOMI STOEHR

8 commented as follows:

9 MS. STOEHR: Thank you. My name is Naomi
10 Stoehr. I come as a resident of Southern Ohio as a
11 concerned citizen not affiliated with any outside
12 organization.

13 I come to challenge the Department of
14 Energy to honor its commitment to clean up the
15 legacy waste of the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion
16 Plant within a stated timeline. It is my hope that
17 the DOE will not betray its commitment to the people
18 of Piketon, Pike County, adjoining counties, the
19 State of Ohio and the adjoining region to pay for
20 the promise of decontamination and decommissioning
21 of the gaseous plant.

22 This task, as you know, will create decent
23 jobs so urgently needed and restore community safety
24 and environmental wellbeing of Piketon and this
25 county. Thank you.

1 (Applause from audience.)

2 DAN MINTER

3 commented as follows:

4 MR. MINTER: My name is Dan Minter. You
5 have heard from a lot of different folks. When you
6 speak about property owners and residents, I was
7 actually a resident. When I say that, I grew up in
8 the house right next door to this facility, so
9 obviously a life-time resident. I have lived in
10 Pike County all my life.

11 I represent the work force. I have heard
12 a lot of people talk about the work force. For 13
13 years, I have represented the work force here, who
14 in no small part helped end the Cold War and make
15 the world a safer place for everyone today.

16 The products that are produced, it propels
17 our nuclear Navy and prepares our nation to defend
18 itself if ever necessary. So this work force
19 clearly has provided a benefit to this nation.

20 I also serve on the SODI board that has
21 been discussed tonight. This facility is another
22 effort of the community and the work force by
23 working together. This meeting and the purpose of
24 this meeting is to consider both the positive and
25 the negative issues of this process, which should

1 require this type of discussion and input.

2 I hear a lot of emotion. I typically have
3 learned over time that when emotion gets higher than
4 intellect, the results are typically negative. So I
5 think there's a lot of emotion and there needs to be
6 a lot of process to consider both benefit and risk.

7 Again, with that stated, I will submit the
8 rest of my proposal in writing -- my statement in
9 writing. There are three major objectives that need
10 to be met. You heard about national and
11 international interests. Those are profound. You
12 hear about Korea. You hear about Iran. What will
13 be done to avoid the next third world war and
14 country? There has to be an initiative. If this
15 isn't it, what is it?

16 Two, there has to be a process to insure
17 that it's done safely, and there has to be a process
18 to insure that we, as a nation, have the ability to
19 produce our own energy. Relying on other countries
20 for energy has proven time and time again to be an
21 extremely negative process and it endures today. So
22 having energy independence is an extremely important
23 second step.

24 Third, you've heard about the work force
25 and you've heard about things in the past. Cars

1 didn't have seat belts. We didn't have laws in
2 place that exist today. The academia you hear today
3 from the universities, that process will provide the
4 necessary means and external regulatory authorities.
5 During the Cold War perhaps risks were taken that
6 shouldn't have been. This is not dealing with the
7 Cold War. This is avoiding another one.

8 So again, I do support the initiative and
9 study. I do think it benefits us to have a process
10 and this exchange. Thank you very much.

11 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

12 (Applause from floor.)

13 MR. BROWN: Steve Martin is next, he will
14 be followed by Rick Patrick and then Steve Burton.

15 STEVE MARTIN

16 commented as follows:

17 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I would like to
18 thank the board for the opportunity to make comments
19 tonight. I wish you all a good evening.

20 I would like to say my name is Steve
21 Martin. I'm superintendent of the Pike County
22 Career and Technology Center, just across the
23 street. It's an institution I'm very proud of and
24 we do good things for kids.

25 On a personal note, whether you're on

1 former Vice President Al Gore's camp of the global
2 warming debate or you're on the opposite side or
3 you're in the middle, I think there's no doubt that
4 our reliance on fossil or carbon fuels is very short
5 sided. So in that regard, if this process can be
6 deemed safe, I would support the study.

7 Again, on an economic development note, I
8 think that -- I get excited when there's any
9 economic development opportunities for our kids. If
10 this pertends well from the study and can be safe,
11 be effective, be efficient, then I'm anxious to be a
12 part of that training for future employees. With
13 that, that's the end.

14 (Applause from floor.)

15 MR. BROWN: Rick Patrick, Steven Burton
16 and then Geoffrey Sea.

17 RICK PATRICK

18 commented as follows:

19 MR. PATRICK: Good evening. I'm Rick
20 Patrick. I'm a life-long resident of Pike County
21 and I'm a local business consultant with offices in
22 Waverly.

23 I want to first say that I'm supporting
24 the efforts and I'm willing to offer my support in
25 the overall effort in securing the GNEP facilities.

1 Let me first speak to the economics
2 surrounding the potential growth of the facilities
3 in Piketon. Economically, we have a need for
4 additional jobs in the area which would hopefully
5 improve the standard of living in our communities.
6 We have the labor force in Pike and surrounding
7 counties to meet the needs of these GNEP facilities.
8 We have the educational systems and technical
9 resources to support the GNEP initiative.

10 We're losing many of our best qualified
11 individuals to large metropolitan areas due to our
12 limited job potential in our area. We need higher
13 paying jobs to move the economy, generate a more
14 diverse tax base, increase the value of our property
15 and, yes, provide more tax dollars to support our
16 schools and run our programs for our less fortunate.
17 We need these GNEP facilities and support the GNEP
18 siting study.

19 Let me speak to the safety of the current
20 facility and potential future facilities. I have
21 lived 44 of my 54 years within one mile of the
22 current DOE operation, and if anyone would be
23 impacted by the future growth, it would be my
24 family. My father, who retired from the facility
25 after 35 years employment, is approaching 80. My

1 mother is 78 and lives well within one side --
2 within one mile of the current facility. They have
3 survived for many years as both an employee and
4 resident living close to the DOE facility.

5 I know the Piketon plant has a lengthy
6 history of safe operation, as we seem to forget that
7 from time to time. I have no reason to doubt after
8 reading materials regarding the potential GNEP
9 facilities, that the new facilities would continue
10 to run in a safe and environmentally friendly
11 fashion and support our government and our country's
12 energy needs for the future.

13 MR. BROWN: You have one minute left.

14 MR. PATRICK: Lastly, as a business owner
15 and resident, we need to move forward and bring this
16 needed economical boost to our area and, again, move
17 us to the top of supporting our governmental and,
18 yes, country's needs for the future. Thank you.

19 (Applause from audience.)

20 MR. BROWN: Steve Burton followed by
21 Geoffery Sea and the Reverend Charles Wiltshire.

22 RICK PATRICK

23 commented as follows:

24 MR. PATRICK: My name is Steve Burton.
25 I'm business manager of the Tri-state Building

1 Construction Trade Council. The Trade Council
2 represents approximately 25,000 men and women that
3 seek work through the construction industry. We
4 built this plant over 50 years ago. We have not
5 left. Our people make a good living working in this
6 plant and maintaining this plant.

7 I have heard talk about the cleanup.
8 Maybe sometimes education and what's going on at the
9 plant has failed somewhat, as I've heard a lot of
10 people say. I heard one laborer talk about working
11 at Fernald, the cleanup that took place there. I
12 don't know -- evidently the people in this room is
13 not aware that there's an incinerator being built at
14 this site as we speak. It's for the purpose of the
15 start of the cleanup of this facility. It's an
16 incinerator that will start disposing of a lot of
17 the waste that's there. We're in talks with
18 contractors that will do the exact cleanup as what's
19 went on at Fernald. It seems like to me that it can
20 be a win/win situation on all sides, that the site
21 is clean, new technology is brought to the site, new
22 jobs are made.

23 We've got to be careful here that we don't
24 do like people attempted to do when McDonald's and
25 Wendy's was packaging their food in styrofoam boxes.

1 That changed and styrofoam boxes is not being used
2 again. They wanted to shut the McDonald's or the
3 Wendy's down. They won. The people in this room
4 will win here.

5 This is the America that I know. This is
6 the America that brings democracy -- that brings
7 people into a room and gives them the right and
8 ability to say -- to comment.

9 I would say for the building trades --
10 that the elected officials here, I would ask you to
11 pay attention. When the chamber of commerce and the
12 economic development groups and labor speak, and
13 they speak together and are in favor of a study
14 going forward and the brainpower and the enforcement
15 that's in this room, if this facility does become
16 reality, it will become reality and become a very
17 safe place to live and work. Thank you.

18 (Applause from audience.)

19 MR. BROWN: Geoffrey Sea is speaking now,
20 Reverend Charles Wiltshire will follow and then Tom
21 Reiser.

22 GEOFFREY SEA

23 commented as follows:

24 MR. SEA: My name is Geoffrey Sea. I'm
25 with the Southern Ohio Neighbor's Group.

1 We've heard a lot about France here, and
2 specifically the La Hogue processing plant. Well, I
3 happen to know a little thing about that. I'm a
4 writer and I cut my journalistic teeth on the La
5 Hogue plant, on a story regarding it.

6 In 1980, the La Hogue Processing Plant had
7 a transformer fire that knocked out the entire
8 emergency core cooling system and the entire
9 electrical system at the plant threatening to cause
10 an explosion that would have required the evacuation
11 of all of Northern Europe, including London, Demark,
12 Southern Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium, et
13 cetera. That was kept secret by the French
14 government. It was not disclosed, even though the
15 entire plan had to be evacuated.

16 Well, I was working in Boston at the time.
17 I got a call from a European contact telling me
18 about the story, which was unconfirmed. I called
19 the French attaché for nuclear affairs in the United
20 States to ask for confirmation. He called Paris,
21 got back to me and told me that it was absolutely
22 denied, didn't happen, was a pack of lies.

23 About three hours later, I got another
24 call from him. He said that something in what I
25 told him sounded true, so he called a personal

1 friend of his who lived at LaHauge and found out
2 that everything I had told him had been correct. He
3 served as an unidentified undisclosed source for the
4 story that broke that story of the fire in the New
5 York Times.

6 (Applause from audience.)

7 The people of this county are good people.
8 They are good American people. Dan Moore and the
9 people who started SODI and SONIC and all these
10 other acronymic groups realized that, so they called
11 this the American Recycling Center. Well, that's a
12 funny thing because when SODI and SONIC and ePIFNI
13 got their grant, got there award, 52 percent of the
14 award goes to Arriva. Arriva is owned by the French
15 Government. It is the company that runs La Hogue.
16 They are calling this the American Recycling Center?

17 Okay. Now, let me correct some other
18 truths. One of the things I pride myself on as a
19 journalist is that people speak to me off the record
20 and I always protect sources. I have never in my
21 career disclosed an undisclosed source.

22 Well, I'm finishing a book about Piketon.
23 People have been coming and talking to me by the
24 droves. Some of the people in this room who work
25 for these organizations have come and spoken to me,

1 not one, not a few, but a lot of them. They have
2 given me information.

3 Let me break some news. The Paducah
4 Consortium that's working on the GNEP grant for
5 Paducah just went online with its application, it's
6 GNEP application. You can go online and read it.
7 SONIC will not. We have been asking them, Tressie
8 and I and others in SONG have been demanding that
9 they do so. They haven't gone public with it.
10 Well, we know why they won't go public with it,
11 because we have seen drafts of the application. Let
12 me read you some sections from it.

13 MR. BROWN: You've got a minute.

14 FROM FLOOR: Let him speak.

15 MR. SEA: In early 2006, SODI organized a
16 meeting in early 2006, before GNEP was announced.
17 They organized a meeting to explore what was needed
18 to position the community for continued investment
19 in advanced nuclear technology. Position the
20 community. Not find out what the community felt,
21 but position us. Well, have fun positioning us now.
22 Let us tell you our position. We're against it.

23 These are 1,300 signatures on petitions
24 against it, which we will be submitting to the
25 Department of Energy and to our local congress

1 people and other elected officials.

2 MR. BROWN: Geoff, let me suggest that --
3 I think we will have some time at the end of the
4 meeting. If you can make a few concluding remarks,
5 I'll be glad to call on you after all of these folks
6 have spoken to complete your remarks.

7 MR. SEA: Sure. One more quote from the
8 SONIC application that they will not let you see.
9 Quote, "Separate from this proposal, though integral
10 to it, SONIC has proposed a spent nuclear fuel
11 storage facility at Portsmouth," unquote. Not a
12 reprocessing center, not a recycling center, not an
13 advanced breeder reactor, a spent fuel storage
14 facility. A separate proposal that also has been
15 undisclosed and not told to this community.

16 Now everyone in the industry knows that
17 DOE has no intention of putting an advanced breeder
18 reactor or a reprocessing plant at Piketon. It's
19 absurd.

20 I ask that every journalist in the room to
21 make sure you get a copy of our press release before
22 you leave, and every person who is against this, get
23 a copy of our suggested written testimony before you
24 leave the room.

25 MR. BROWN: Okay. If you can just --

1 MR. SEA: In our press release is a
2 statement by a Ph.D. hydrologist evaluating this
3 site showing that it's absurd. The only thing that
4 DOE has ever considered this site for is spent fuel
5 storage. They have used intimidation and threats
6 and bullying and blackmail to get this project
7 through here. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

9 (Applause from audience.)

10 MR. BROWN: Reverend Charles Wiltshire
11 followed by Tom Reiser and then Lisa Corum Fox.

12 REVEREND CHARLES WILTSHIRE
13 commented as follows:

14 MR. WILTSHIRE: My name is Charles
15 Wiltshire and I have pastored churches in Southern
16 Ohio for the past 35 years. I have a letter tonight
17 that I would like to read from the current church I
18 pastor.

19 Sedan Baptist Church is very encouraged by
20 DOE's decision to investigate the possible siting of
21 a GNEP facility at the Portsmouth plant located in
22 Piketon, Ohio. This encouragement is based upon the
23 potential for creating good jobs in an area of
24 extremely high unemployment. Good jobs are a must
25 for a healthy well-developed community.

1 We are encouraged at the prospect of a
2 newer process for recycling spent fuels that is
3 based upon safer technologies that will lower the
4 risk of long-term storage of nuclear wastes, help to
5 protect the environment and will produce fuels that
6 are much needed for future electrical needs.

7 Please accept our offer of support for the
8 current siting study underway for a possible GNEP
9 facility at Piketon, and our request for your
10 sincere consideration to locate the facility here
11 once the studies are concluded and you have the
12 necessary data before you for your final analysis
13 and decision. For a safer and brighter tomorrow,
14 Reverend Charles Wiltshire, Sedan Baptist Church,
15 Pastor.

16 I also have some letters from community
17 members that I would like to submit for the record
18 also.

19 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

20 (Appause from audience.)

21 MR. BROWN: Tom Reiser, Lisa Corum Fox and
22 Andrew Feight. If folks are going to have
23 conversations, just out of kindness to the
24 presenters, if you would, step into the hallway and
25 do that. Thank you.

1 TOM REISER

2 commented as follows:

3 MR. REISER: I'm Tom Reiser and I'm a
4 Scioto County Commissioner. Several months ago, the
5 Scioto County Commissioners passed a resolution
6 supporting SODI and SONIC for the submission of the
7 proposal for funding of a planning grant for the
8 Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

9 We continue to support the stated mission
10 of SONIC to identify, develop and deploy safe
11 environmentally responsible reindustrialization
12 projects at the Piketon DOE site. We also support a
13 continued commercial nuclear presence at the Piketon
14 site which will preserve existing jobs, create new
15 opportunities and continue to contribute to the
16 regional economy.

17 We believe very strongly that a failure to
18 explore new possibilities for the
19 reindustrialization of the Piketon site, including
20 this study, is definitely not in the best interest
21 of the region and would be irresponsible to abandon
22 at this point.

23 (Applause from audience.)

24 MR. BROWN: Lisa Corum Fox, Andrew Feight
25 and Eugene Collins.

1 LISA CORUM FOX

2 commented as follows:

3 MS. FOX: Hi. I'm Lisa Corum Fox. I'm
4 the pastor of the oldest church building in Ohio
5 still in use as a church. It's in Adams County and
6 its founders came in the 1790s to work against
7 slavery. At that point when slavery was a
8 profitable enterprise, they knew that it was a
9 cancer on our democracy destroying slave and master.
10 They worked and they were bullied and mistreated and
11 put down. And 70 years later, we had a war that
12 ended slavery with much loss of life and much loss
13 of money.

14 I support the people who see nuclear
15 energy and the proliferation of it as a cancer. It
16 is profitable and possibly cleaner than some things
17 if you juggle the words just so, but it isn't an
18 answer in our day.

19 I'm concerned about two things that I
20 noticed about our democracy in this particular
21 thing. The first being that my husband asked if our
22 newspaper would notify about this meeting and we got
23 a notice back that, no, the associate editor didn't
24 want to make this public. Why? Why in a democracy
25 is a meeting like this not made public? That

1 concerns me.

2 The other concern I have is there are a
3 fair number of us here from Adams County, and I'm
4 thankful to each one that's here. You know,
5 actually to be honest, I see people on both sides
6 who families have sat in the pews where I have
7 preached. I just want to say God loves them all --
8 all, everybody. Every side has had tragedies. I
9 have seen people right here who have had tragedies
10 that are terrible. I just know that God loves us on
11 both sides and wants us to work for no tragedies.

12 But the other piece I wanted to say --
13 didn't mean to give a sermon here -- is that in this
14 land of the free, I had no freedom about how to come
15 here tonight. Why is there no mass transit? Why
16 couldn't we have come together? Whoever is here
17 from the Department of Energy, I ask you to please
18 consider other things that would bring jobs to our
19 community. Think of the welders that would be
20 employed if we put some kind of mass transit in
21 here. Think of the things that would be good for
22 our people if we moved in a different manner.

23 I have heard several times tonight that to
24 keep our lifestyle the way it is, we need more
25 energy. I'm speaking here as a pastor that some

1 things about our lifestyle are not good, and that
2 less might be more. We have tremendous depression,
3 addiction and health issues in our nation, and I
4 think sometimes we would be better off if we turned
5 more things off and were just with each other and
6 this planet. I think we would be better off.

7 So I invite us to consider things that say
8 no to more, that it isn't always the answer to have
9 more of everything, that really we're losing.

10 But thanks to every one of you that are
11 here. It is fun. This is what democracy looks
12 like, and I'm glad you're here.

13 (Applause from audience.)

14 MR. BROWN: You were right at the
15 three-minute mark. My twin brother is a minister,
16 so I was very reluctant in telling you because I
17 might have been hit by a lightning bolt or
18 something. Thank you.

19 ANDREW FEIGHT

20 commented as follows:

21 MR. FEIGHT: My name is Doctor Andrew
22 Feight. I'm a professor of history at Shawnee State
23 University. I'm not a nuclear physicist so I can't
24 say this is my professional opinion. I look at
25 things from a historical perspective, and that's

1 where I'm coming from, I guess.

2 In preparation for coming out here, I
3 decided I was going to make some signs. I went to
4 the local drug store in Portsmouth and the young
5 lady that was checking me out at the counter, she
6 said, "What are you going to do with these?" I
7 couldn't believe she asked me. I said, "I'm making
8 protest signs." She said, "What are you
9 protesting?" I said, "Well, I'm protesting this
10 proposal to put a nuclear reprocessing plant where
11 they are going to extract plutonium out of spent
12 nuclear fuel rods, that's high-level radioactive
13 waste, and basically they are going to ship it from
14 all over the United States to Piketon if they get
15 it, and I don't think it's a good idea." Well, she
16 said, "Who would want that?" I said, "Exactly."
17 Then she said, "It's not like people aren't already
18 getting sick around here from the old A-Plant and
19 everything else." People are already getting sick
20 and they say, oh, it's -- you don't need to worry
21 about it. It's fine. That's what she said to me.
22 I said, "Well, can you come to the meeting," and she
23 said that she couldn't.

24 I'm not here alone. I'm speaking for many
25 people. I passed petitions. I didn't even spend

1 very much time passing petitions, and I got 45
2 signatures in probably less than an hour. I had one
3 person say, "No, I don't want to sign it. Not
4 because I think it's a good idea to put the stuff
5 there, it's just that I'm apolitical, and on
6 principle, I don't sign any petitions."

7 MR. BROWN: You're at the --

8 MR. FEIGHT: One minute?

9 MR. BROWN: -- one minute mark, yes.

10 MR. FEIGHT: Let me say something else
11 about this one-minute time limit and all of this.
12 Next time, please come to Shawnee State University.
13 We have a very large facility to fit everybody. And
14 why don't you put a little more time in to it and
15 give us real freedom of speech.

16 (Applause from audience.)

17 MR. FEIGHT: Now, thanks for the applause,
18 but, please, I only have a minute.

19 Picketon should be removed from the
20 candidate list because the community does not
21 support this. This community support has been
22 fraudulently asserted by SODI and SONIC. Let me
23 tell you this about SONIC and SODI. There is self
24 interest -- personal self interest of people from
25 SODI, in SONIC and ePIFNI. The same officials are

1 officials in these new private corporations that are
2 on the SODI board. Some of the previous speakers up
3 here, these scientists, I would say, from
4 Cincinnati, they have a personal interest in this as
5 well. I'm not sure what my personal interest is in
6 this. Maybe that's why I don't like it.

7 MR. BROWN: Make one more point. Thanks.

8 MR. FEIGHT: Let me just say this.

9 Complete and final cleanup of the old plant, true
10 diversification, true redevelopment is going to be
11 based upon cleaning up the old plant, bringing in
12 nonnuclear industries, then we will see
13 redevelopment. Then we will have the jobs for these
14 fine workers that we have here in our community,
15 these great workers that deserve good, safe jobs.
16 Thank you.

17 (Applause from audience.)

18 MR. BROWN: Eugene Collins, Patricia
19 Marida and then Dennis Simpson.

20 EUGENE COLLINS

21 commented as follows:

22 MR. COLLINS: First of all, I would like
23 to say to each and every one of you here that this
24 is proven to be a very concerned issue, and it
25 should be a concerned issue. From an economic

1 development standpoint, this could be a crucial
2 project for this area to grow. I think it's a thing
3 that we all have to be concerned about.

4 When we speak in terms of a study, I think
5 if we all look at the reality of the study, then
6 this is the key to the whole thing. Number one is
7 that everybody in this room wants to make sure that
8 if this opportunity does hit this area, that it's
9 safe and healthy for everybody, the individuals that
10 work at the plant and also the individuals that live
11 around the plant.

12 The other key thing that I think that we
13 all need to be focused on is the fact of holding DOE
14 responsible. We are fortunate enough to have a
15 governor who has served as a congressman and
16 understand the responsibility of DOE. I feel very
17 strongly that if this study is done and it becomes
18 the reality that their intention is to make a
19 dumping site out of Piketon, you have a governor
20 that will fight this to the bitter end. That will
21 not happen.

22 (Applause from audience.)

23 MR. COLLINS: The other end of it is that
24 I feel very strongly from the standpoint of the
25 safety of every individual in this room, and also

1 their family. Nobody, absolutely nobody that stood
2 up at this podium wants to see any type of project
3 put in this area that is going to take someone's
4 life. I don't think anyone in here wants to see
5 that happen. I think you have strong commitments
6 from individuals that's pushing this process that
7 they will not stand still and allow DOE to do what
8 they have done in the past. Thank you.

9 (Applause from audience.)

10 MR. BROWN: Patricia Marida, Dennis
11 Simpson will follow and then Joni Fearing.

12 PATRICIA MARIDA

13 commented as follows:

14 MS. MARIDA: Hello. I'm Pat Marida. I'm
15 submitting these comments at a member of the toxics
16 committee. I'm submitting them on behalf of the
17 Ohio Sierra Club, and the Ohio Sierra Club
18 represents about 15,000 members in the State of
19 Ohio.

20 The Ohio Sierra Club opposes in the
21 strongest possible terms all of the proposals being
22 considered for the Piketon, Ohio nuclear site under
23 the auspices of the Bush Administration's Global
24 Nuclear Energy Partnership.

25 I have just some general comments. The

1 cascade of confusing and hastily put-together
2 proposals for the nuclear facilities by GNEP is
3 rivaled only by the speed at which ePIFNI was
4 formed, combined with the Southern Ohio Diversity
5 Initiative to form the consortium SONIC, proposed an
6 application to study placement of the facilities at
7 Piketon, and was granted money for the study. The
8 original amount of money to be granted for the study
9 was advertised by the DOE to be five million
10 dollars. The timeline for completion of the study
11 and the siting of the facilities falls far short of
12 the time needed to assess such massive and complex
13 proposals, if indeed a plan for dealing with such
14 large quantities of highly radioactive materials
15 could ever be devised. Such massive plans call for
16 multiple public hearings in all parts of Ohio, yet
17 the DOE has scheduled only one hearing.

18 I have general comments/subjects for the
19 PEIS. Assessment of nuclear terrorism and diversion
20 threats, assessment of dangers of accidents in
21 route, assessment of the cost to the public,
22 assessment of the number of jobs created and
23 assessment of the ability to remove radioactive
24 waste from Piketon.

25 I would like to make a few comments about

1 assessment of the disposition of reprocessed
2 uranium.

3 MR. BROWN: Can you do that in a minute, I
4 hope?

5 MS. MARIDA: Almost.

6 MR. BROWN: All right.

7 MS. MARIDA: Uranium makes up the bulk of
8 material separated from spent nuclear fuel through
9 reprocessing. This uranium is contaminated with
10 U-236 and U-232 isotopes, which according to the
11 Union of Concerned Scientists, is highly undesirable
12 for reuse as fuel and unsuitable for shallow burial.
13 The GNEP documents suggest erroneously that this
14 recycled uranium can be reused as fuel and that it
15 can be easily disposed of in low-level nuclear waste
16 facilities.

17 DOE already has a current inventory of
18 hundreds of thousands of tons of depleted uranium,
19 which is a much less hazardous substance, but this
20 already poses a massive disposal problem for DOE and
21 the nation. So how can the DOE claim that it would
22 be a simple task to dispose of tens of thousands of
23 tons of much more highly contaminated reprocessed
24 uranium? So the PEIS must present reprocessed
25 uranium disposition plans that are highly -- that

1 are technically defensible.

2 MR. BROWN: Could you make just one more
3 point, please?

4 MS. MARIDA: Two short points. There's an
5 addendum that the Environmental Community
6 Organization in Cincinnati has said that they concur
7 with these comments. They are concerned about
8 transportation safety throughout Ohio.

9 Lastly, I would just like to say that
10 across the way I have brought from the Dayton Daily
11 News copies of Ohio's Nuclear Legacy, and it's about
12 contamination and things mostly about Piketon.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

15 (Applause from audience.)

16 MR. BROWN: Dennis Simpson, Joni Fearing
17 and then Greg Simonton. And, we have had additional
18 people sign up to speak. Again, I'm sorry to be so
19 insistent. Is Dennis Simpson here?

20 FROM FLOOR: I think you're doing a pretty
21 good job.

22 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Joni Fearing then
23 Greg Simonton.

24 JONI FEARING

25 commented as follows:

1 MS. FEARING: I'm from Portsmouth, and I
2 drink my own bottled water. I just wanted to point
3 that out.

4 FROM FLOOR: Good thing.

5 MS. FEARING: As I said, my name is Joni
6 Fearing. I'm a resident of Portsmouth. I'm a
7 graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary as a
8 minister of divinity.

9 I just want to say something. On a
10 theological perspective, you cannot separate soil
11 and water from human beings. The word Adam, the
12 first man, adamah, in Hebrew means earth, soil. If
13 you put anything into the earth or the soil or the
14 water system, it's going to be in us. The whole
15 idea to me that this is an environmental impact
16 statement is -- we are of the environment. You
17 can't separate the two. Scientists are always
18 trying to do that, and it drives me crazy.

19 My parents moved from Kentucky to
20 Portsmouth as newlyweds, where dad worked at the
21 atomic plant for ten years from '54 to '64. He was
22 bringing uranium and strontium home every day on his
23 clothing, and even more in his body. Dad died of
24 four cancers, including bone and lung. My mom, who
25 complained about his dusty clothes when she washed

1 them, she suffered from secondary exposures. She
2 had a very rare cancer later. She also suffered
3 from nervous disorders and some unexplainable pain
4 throughout most of her life.

5 We focus on the cancer part of it all the
6 time, but these toxic substances, I'm here to tell
7 you, can cause all kinds of immune system disorders,
8 infertility, miscarriage. I have a sister who has
9 rheumatoid arthritis at a very young age. They can
10 cause all kinds of very strange and unexplainable
11 health problems. The breakdown of immune system can
12 cause a number of conditions to develop. Plutonium
13 and uranium are the most toxic of these substances.

14 Having returned to Portsmouth in 2004, I
15 was shocked and dismayed by the lack of industry and
16 employment. I, myself, have had trouble getting
17 work here, so I understand that fully. But my
18 understanding of this, as many said, is that this
19 will provide very few real jobs. And bringing, as
20 many have said, a toxic dump here to Portsmouth and
21 this Piketon area will make it less desirable for
22 other businesses to come in with their families. If
23 we really want help, we need better policies that
24 encourage manufacturers to consider this desirable
25 place.

1 MR. BROWN: You have one minute.

2 MS. FEARING: One minute?

3 MR. BROWN: Yes.

4 MS. FEARING: I thought your brother was a
5 minister. Are you going to cut me off?

6 Last week I drove to Maysville and I had
7 to pass by that huge nuclear reactor, you know, and
8 in the back of my mind, I'm thinking Hershey,
9 Pennsylvania, "We glow in the dark." I saw people
10 with t-shirts that said that, and Chernobyl, of
11 course, which needs to be mentioned. Do we not
12 learn from these horrific mistakes?

13 There are alternative sources of energy
14 that we need to consider. My friends in New Jersey
15 have solar panels on their room. On sunny days,
16 their meter runs backwards. They supply the grid
17 and their solar panels will be paid for in like ten
18 years. They overlook the Tom's River Nuclear Plant.
19 You can see it across the bay on a clear day. So
20 this image I have to give to you tonight is the
21 solar panels on top of this roof facing off to the
22 nuclear -- I'm a minister, so I can't swear.

23 My father was proud to serve his country.
24 He served in the Air Force during the Korean War and
25 he served at the A-Plant during the Cold War. He

1 knew the dangers when going into the military. He
2 took those risks bravely. He did not know the risks
3 when he worked at the A-Plant. He trusted his
4 government, which he had faithfully served, to
5 protect him and his family.

6 And aren't we in -- no one has mentioned
7 the current war that I've heard tonight. What was
8 that about? Wasn't that like suspected nuclear
9 activity? Like we're going to spread global nuclear
10 partnership? Come on. You're going to spread more
11 nuclear fuel around the world so it's even more
12 available to people that want to get it?

13 We have a huge Amish group in this state.
14 They are almost like 100 percent energy free --
15 energy secured.

16 MR. BROWN: Just one last point.

17 MS. FEARING: One last point.

18 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. I just got a list
19 of 15 more speakers.

20 MS. FEARING: I understand. I think I've
21 said it all. You know, the people of Appalachian
22 Ohio have given enough. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: Greg Simonton, Wally Burden

1 and Michelle Asamian.

2 GREG SIMONTON

3 commented as follows:

4 MR. SIMONTON: Thank you very much.

5 Again, my name is Greg Simonton. I represent SODI,
6 the focus of a lot of discussion tonight.

7 I've got to say that our sole mission is
8 focusing on the economic health of the region. Our
9 work includes insuring that the Portsmouth site here
10 in Piketon remains a vital part of the community.
11 To do that, we need to make sure the missions are
12 safe for the workers, the communities and their
13 families.

14 I would like to talk for a second about
15 some things that I can tell you that we agree with.
16 We certainly do not advocate the creation of only a
17 waste dump. That is not what we are advocating. We
18 have stated that many times, time and time again.
19 We believe that GNEP does hold a great potential and
20 a great promise. As a current nuclear facility with
21 a current mission that will run for decades, we
22 think that it's the potential to provide an
23 important link to meeting our nation's and the
24 world's energy needs.

25 Some will argue that our site should cease

1 its nuclear operations. I can hear some of the
2 discussion tonight is not only GNEP, but nuclear
3 entirely. I respect that. I respect the voice and
4 I respect the critic's right to say that. I do,
5 however, respectfully disagree.

6 As I have met with so many members of our
7 community -- I literally have met with various
8 groups. I have experienced overwhelming support for
9 this. I didn't ask them to mobilize for tonight.
10 The purpose of the meeting was a scoping meeting.
11 But now I feel like I have to say that our statement
12 of principles that we adopted early on is that all
13 cleanup and reuse activities must protect human
14 health and the environment both on site and off
15 site.

16 We remain steadfastly opposed to
17 Portsmouth becoming a dump for high-level waste.
18 Regardless of the end use of this site, be it GNEP,
19 be it centrifuge, be it a combination of those or
20 others, we have to have a commitment to cleaning up
21 the site no matter what the use is.

22 MR. BROWN: You've got a minute left.

23 MR. SIMONTON: We've teamed up with our
24 partners in SONIC because they believe this
25 evaluation is an important first step, an important

1 first step in meeting some broadly held local and
2 national priorities. And as part of our site study,
3 we will host more public meetings. This is an
4 opportunity for the community to come together and
5 to be able to have input into this process. We
6 believe it is in addition to this PEIS scoping
7 meeting comment period, and we do welcome all
8 members to come forward March the 20th. Please
9 participate. Thank you very much.

10 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

11 (Applause from audience.)

12 MR. BROWN: Wally Burden, Michelle Asamian
13 and then Bill Franz.

14 WALLY BURDEN

15 commented as follows:

16 MR. BURDEN: Good evening. I'm Wally
17 Burden. I have the pleasure to serve as the Health
18 Commissioner for Pike County. Our mission is to
19 prevent, promote and protect.

20 I want to begin by thanking the Department
21 of Energy for the opportunity to speak. I'm here to
22 support the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership siting
23 study. I believe that the study, such as the one
24 proposed, is timely and will provide for our
25 community with the necessary tools to make informed

1 decisions about our future. Opportunities such as
2 this one allow our community voices to be heard and
3 to allow for transparent processes for all concerned
4 stakeholders.

5 I hope that this study will foster
6 environmentally responsible reprocessing of nuclear
7 materials. It is my hope that this study will
8 provide our area with essential information to solve
9 long-term economic opportunities, environmental
10 opportunities and to deal closely with our federal
11 government and their partners.

12 Dennis Spurgeon, the Assistant Secretary
13 for Nuclear Energy, stated on November 28th, 2006 at
14 a press conference that this study will require no
15 long-term storage. These GNEP facilities will
16 provide a pathway to processing the used nuclear
17 fuel.

18 Our community is counting on this siting
19 study to do a comprehensive site analysis, a
20 complete environmental impact statement and to
21 ensure that regulators will be in place to ensure
22 safety and environmental surety for our community
23 and our region.

24 Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

25 (Applause from audience.)

1 MR. BROWN: Michelle Asamian? Bill Franz?
2 Okay, Bill is here. Then Catherine Cutcher will
3 follow Bill and then Bill McCormick.

4 BILL FRANZ

5 commented as follows:

6 MR. FRANZ: My name is Bill Franz. I live
7 in Chillicothe. I guess I'm one of the few speakers
8 here tonight other than Dan Minter that is actually
9 working on the cleanup at Portsmouth. It's just
10 started, but it will happen. Before that, I helped
11 clean up the mound plant. That's complete. Before
12 that, Rocky Flatts, and that's complete. Before
13 that, Three Mile Island. So you can see I've kind
14 of seen a little bit of the down side and
15 experienced some of the concerns people have here.
16 All those concerns were met -- they were met by good
17 people, like the people that work at the Piketon
18 plant today, and would like to work there and see
19 their children work there tomorrow.

20 I firmly support the GNEP concept. I just
21 think it makes a lot of sense to reprocess the fuel.
22 It's going to make the waste disposal, which
23 obviously is a technical and political problem right
24 now, that much easier. Should it be sited in
25 Piketon? I think that's what the study is for, and

1 I think the study has to be done objectively, but it
2 has to be done.

3 I think the community would benefit from
4 this facility. You have the work force here,
5 certainly, and, from my experience, one of the best.

6 That's my support. I thank you for the
7 chance to speak.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

9 (Applause from audience.)

10 MR. BROWN: Catherine Cutcher, Bill
11 McCormick and Elizabeth Motter.

12 CATHERINE CUTCHER

13 commented as follows:

14 MS. CUTCHER: Thank you for the
15 opportunity to speak. My name is Catherine Cutcher.
16 I am a program and development coordinator for the
17 Appalachian Peace and Justice Network located in
18 Athens, Ohio. I'm from Meigs County. I'm also a
19 professor at Ohio University and the College of
20 Education.

21 I came out tonight for a couple of
22 reasons. First of all, our organization was founded
23 in 1984. Basically we grew out of community efforts
24 to organize citizens in Southeast Ohio who were
25 concerned about the Piketon plant here. We have

1 been very much involved in peace and justice work
2 since that time.

3 I am here tonight to say that the
4 Appalachian Peace and Justice Network supports
5 democratic processes. And I believe, from what I
6 have witnessed here tonight, that democracy is
7 really not happening here. Since this hearing is on
8 procedural issues, I would like to say that the
9 history of deception over this whole process is very
10 questionable.

11 I have a couple of points about the
12 presentation. First of all, I think that naming the
13 plant here as a recycling plant is very deceptive.
14 First of all, this is an example of the Orwellian
15 language adopted by our federal administration.
16 They use terms like the Health Forest Initiative,
17 the Clear Skies Initiative, Iraqi Freedom to define
18 things that really are not about what they're
19 saying.

20 (Applause from audience.)

21 MS. CUTCHER: I also want to ask the
22 administration to get your geography right. I kept
23 hearing the term Nambia used. I am an advocate
24 study specialist. There is no such country called
25 Nambia. I suppose maybe you were referring to

1 Namibia or Zambia, but not Nambia.

2 Another point that was made is that you
3 talked about your potential global partners, such as
4 France, the UK, Russia, Japan and Canada. You did
5 not mention Israel, which is a huge nuclear power in
6 our world. You don't ever mention our connections
7 there.

8 I believe that, you know, developing
9 nuclear energy is really irresponsible today when we
10 have the technology to develop renewable energy
11 sources. I believe that nuclear energy is very
12 risky. It is very dangerous.

13 We heard a lot about the aquifer that this
14 plant is sitting on. When we talk about the war on
15 terror, we do not want to basically centralize all
16 of the nuclear waste in this country right here in
17 Piketon, Ohio. I really worry about the fact that,
18 you know, the federal government thinks that we here
19 in Southern Ohio are poor, that maybe we don't have
20 education, that maybe we can't get organized. Well
21 here we are, and we are here to say no. We don't
22 need this and we don't want this anywhere in this
23 country.

24 So I'm here today to say, you know,
25 support the development of renewable energy sources

1 such as solar, wind, geothermal and ethanol, for
2 example. Ohio is a huge producer of corn. This is
3 a farming state. We can produce a lot of corn that
4 can be converted to ethanol. So if you want to talk
5 about renewable safe energy, let's talk about that,
6 not about nuclear. We need to get past that.

7 MR. BROWN: Make just one more point.

8 MS. CUTCHER: Okay. We have a lot of
9 security and environmental concerns, also health.
10 How many people in this room have cancer or have a
11 family member who has cancer? Okay. I just want to
12 say that Ohio is one of the most polluted states in
13 this country. We do not need greater pollution
14 coming to us on railways, on roadways, maybe on
15 planes from other countries. We don't need this.
16 We have enough pollution to deal with in our bodies,
17 in our rivers and in our soil. We need to clean
18 that up. That's all I have to say.

19 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

20 (Applause from audience.)

21 MR. BROWN: Bill McCormick.

22 BILL MCCORMICK

23 commented as follows:

24 MR. MCCORMICK: Hello. I'm Bill
25 McCormick. I'm a resident of Cincinnati and a

1 resident of Ohio, a concerned citizen of Ohio.

2 I'm wondering, why am I being asked, as an
3 American citizen, to pay for this kind of facility
4 here, either here in Piketon or anywhere else? Why
5 am I being asked to pay for these facilities that
6 are only going to encourage more production of
7 nuclear waste? I don't see any sense to it. I
8 think if we want to take care of the problem of
9 nuclear waste, let's, first of all, stop producing
10 it.

11 (Applause from audience.)

12 MR. MCCORMICK: Let's send it back to the
13 people who are producing it and say take care of
14 your problem people, take care of it in a
15 responsible way, not by putting it in the ground
16 somewhere, but in a safe way that won't harm people,
17 and mainly stop doing it. Thank you.

18 (Applause from audience.)

19 MR. BROWN: Elizabeth Motter, Jerry
20 Carrico will follow her and then Margaret Lehry.

21 ELIZABETH MOTTER

22 commented as follows:

23 MS. MOTTER: Hi. I'm also from
24 Cincinnati. There are quite a few of us here from
25 Cincinnati. We're down river from all of this, and

1 there is an issue about the water.

2 I have, in fact, brought a paper, to add a
3 little intellect to all this emotion, written by
4 Richard Hayes Phillips, who holds a Ph.D. in
5 geomorphology from the University of Oregon. His
6 dissertation is entitled "The Prospects for Regional
7 Groundwater Contamination due to Karst Landforms in
8 Mescalero Caliche at the WIPP site near Calsbad, New
9 Mexico." He has written or co-authored more than 20
10 professional papers on proposed or existing nuclear
11 sites in New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas, and has
12 been recognized as an expert witness in Resource
13 Conservation and Recovery Act proceedings. He has
14 taught courses in geology, geography and history at
15 seven colleges and universities. I have an
16 abstract, and I won't even read the whole thing
17 because it's extremely technical.

18 There is a groundwater -- potential
19 groundwater issue here. I would just like to say on
20 my own behalf, before I read some of what Richard
21 wrote, that this is not just about Picketon. I am
22 not in favor of the proliferation of nuclear
23 technology anywhere, not here, not anywhere in the
24 country or the world. I think it's dangerous.

25 I have a particular problem with

1 technology such as this that pass on our mistakes to
2 future generations. The word "responsibility" has
3 been used a lot here tonight. I think that no
4 matter how many safeguards are put in to place, it
5 can never be as safe as we need it to be. There are
6 plenty of other options that we can explore with
7 this type of resource and energy. So I would like
8 to see that happen.

9 MR. BROWN: Just give us a quick excerpt
10 of this.

11 MS. MOTTER: I'll begin at the end of
12 Richard's piece, because the conclusion is at the
13 end. The Piketon site is a risky, reckless location
14 for nuclear reprocessing and incineration
15 facilities, or for relocation of spent nuclear fuel
16 even on a temporary basis. Containment would have
17 to be fail-safe and fool-proof. Failure of
18 containment would jeopardize both the scenic Scioto
19 River and the vital groundwater aquifer. Because
20 the two are highly interconnected, contamination of
21 one would inevitably contaminate the other.

22 I guess I'll just submit his papers.
23 Thank you.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: Jerry Carrico is next then

1 Margaret Lehry and then Anita Sorkin.

2 JERRY CARRICO

3 commented as follows:

4 MR. CARRICO: Good evening, ladies and
5 gentleman. I'll try to keep this short because I
6 learned a long time ago that the brain can only
7 absorb what the bottom can endure.

8 Now, since we were not allowed to ask any
9 clarifying questions on this, I'll have to proceed
10 based on how I understand this. At this point,
11 there is no guarantee, not even an assurance. Heck,
12 there's not even so much as a political promise that
13 the repository will be co-located with the plants.

14 Now, as I understand it, Savannah River,
15 South Carolina, they want those plants, but they do
16 not want the repository, won't touch it with a barge
17 pole. So whose to say that they won't give Savannah
18 River the plants and the repository go to Piketon?
19 If you guys sign off on this -- I mean, after all,
20 think about it like a politician. We have done one
21 thing for this site, so we'll do something else for
22 this one. Now, that's two political favors -- count
23 them, two political favors for the price of one.

24 Folks, if that happens, you're not going
25 to get that basket full of high-priced jobs that

1 you're talking about. Oh, you'll get a few, maybe a
2 hundred, and they won't be all that high priced.
3 Because after all, you're just running a dump.

4 Another thing I noticed, DOE likes to
5 refer to this as temporary storage. After all, it
6 is temporary. I mean, the fuel rods come in here
7 and then they go out and get reprocessed. Right?
8 Of course, more fuel rods come in to take their
9 place. So by that logic, Wal*Mart is a temporary
10 store. It can sit in the same place for 25 years
11 doing the same volume of business and is still
12 temporary, because after all the merchandise doesn't
13 stay there, does it?

14 (Applause from audience.)

15 MR. BROWN: Margaret Lehry, Anita Sorkin
16 and Sylvia Lieb.

17 MARGARET LEHRY

18 commented as follows:

19 MS. LEHRY: I'm Margaret Lehry, and I'm a
20 resident of Waverly.

21 The biggest oxymoron that has occurred
22 here tonight has been them telling you how great
23 nuclear energy is, how clean it is, how
24 environmentally friendly it is. Why is it costing
25 so many billions of dollars to clean it up?

1 (Applause from audience.)

2 MS. LEHRY: It's not a front-end loaded
3 annuity. It's a rear-end loaded annuity.

4 FROM FLOOR: And it's our rear ends
5 getting loaded.

6 MS. LEHRY: And they want the manure pile
7 in Piketon.

8 I greatly recommend that Piketon no longer
9 be considered for this manure pile. It's a
10 travesty. Thank you.

11 (Applause from audience.)

12 MR. BROWN: Anita Sorkin, Sylvia Lieb and
13 David Manuta.

14 ANITA SORKIN

15 commented as follows:

16 MS. SORKIN: Hi. I'm Anita Sorkin. I'm
17 also from Cincinnati, Hamilton County.

18 I am a chapter leader in Cincinnati of an
19 organization called Weston A. Price Foundation. It
20 was founded in 1999. It is now international.
21 Among its many missions is to support local real
22 food and also to support farmers -- family farmers
23 to actually make a living wage, and even a good one.
24 So in doing that -- that's one thought I had in
25 terms of when I was listening to this, about the

1 obvious need for jobs around here is to support an
2 area where we think of Ohio as a farm state, so why
3 not support farmers to make real food and that's how
4 they can survive.

5 I wanted to just briefly say the other
6 things that came to mind as I was listening. My
7 family was researching moving to Pennsylvania for a
8 number of reasons, and in doing that, I stumbled
9 across what I found to be quite interesting. And
10 more than that, I stumbled upon the fact that
11 Pennsylvania is sort of a double digit nuclear power
12 plant state. I met a woman wanting to know more who
13 has now sacrificed her whole life for the last 15
14 years because she has property there and has always
15 lived there for generations. Her whole mission is
16 to expose all the horrors of nuclear power. When I
17 heard the presentation about it only having problems
18 when there's a problem, she assured me that every
19 time it breaths, every moment, it's spewing out
20 something that you don't really want.

21 Secondly, she also let me know that spent
22 fuel rods are actually more lethal than the ones
23 that are working. Also, another person made a point
24 here, another speaker, that the transport of spent
25 fuel rods is incredibly dangerous and accidents

1 always happen. If you can spill, pigs, cows and
2 mercury on the freeways, you can spill spent fuel
3 rods, and they shouldn't be moved.

4 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

5 MS. SORKIN: Okay. She also told me all
6 about the horrors of the increased cancer incidents
7 and the many, many thyroid cancers that are in her
8 area.

9 When I was considering coming tonight, I
10 told a few people -- asked if they wanted to come
11 and everybody I talked to -- every woman I talked to
12 said, "Why do we have to have it in the first
13 place?" which is echoed in many other people's
14 comments. Why do we have to have it in the first
15 place? Why do we even have to have this discussion
16 about what to do with the junk and the garbage that
17 comes as a result.

18 My last point is that I can now answer
19 them, those friends of mine who ask that question,
20 because as I stand in this building space, it is the
21 perfect example of wasting energy. This is a winter
22 evening almost, winter/spring, and here we are
23 wanting to strip down to our summer clothing because
24 we're overheating this building and every other
25 building in the United States.

1 If we would wear appropriate clothing like
2 Jimmy Carter asked us to a long time ago, maybe we
3 wouldn't be worshipping nuclear power plants.

4 MR. BROWN: State your final point.

5 MS. SORKIN: Okay. I'm just wanting to
6 say that it is a short-sided plan, and getting a few
7 jobs is also short-sided. I have a publication here
8 called the Publication of the NIRS, Nuclear
9 Information Resource Service. I suggest anybody who
10 wants to know more get on their mailing list and get
11 their journals. I also have a video of the horrors
12 going on in Pennsylvania.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

14 (Applause from audience.)

15 MR. BROWN: Sylvia Lieb, David Manuta and
16 then Reverend Roland William Carroll.

17 SYLVIA LIEB

18 commented as follows:

19 MS. LIEB: Hi. I'm Sylvia Lieb. I'm a
20 concerned citizen of Adams County. We have lived
21 here about 30 years, moved down from Northern Ohio
22 to Southern Ohio. The first nine years or so, we
23 lived without electricity, and it was fine. It was
24 quite fine. We lived pretty comfortable, pretty
25 happy without electricity or a lot of power. I'm

1 just here to tell you that's okay. We can do it.

2 My concerns are environmental. I'm
3 concerned, too, about the aquifer being polluted.
4 It doesn't make sense to me that something that
5 dangerous be put on top of it.

6 I'm also concerned about transportation.
7 I don't understand how that would work, but I know
8 you don't get to answer questions tonight. That's
9 my big concern.

10 Then my final comment is that we all know
11 that our fearless leader is in Brazil today visiting
12 Brazil. My hope is that he gets inspired by their
13 energy independence in that country, because they
14 make ethanol from their sugar cane. And they get
15 some power from their Amazon River, but we could do
16 other things in this country if we so desired.

17 We could even put in compact fluorescent
18 bulbs so that we have some smart kind of energy use
19 in our government buildings and in our schools and
20 such. That's all I have to say about that.

21 Oh, and here's the last thing. I, too,
22 did not get an article written in my paper that I
23 wrote and sent in. They didn't print it. I would
24 like the Department of Energy to inform all the
25 papers in the state that you're having these

1 meetings, and not just in the little town of
2 Piketon.

3 (Applause from audience.)

4 MS. LIEB: It effects all of us, it being
5 on the road being transported and it being maybe
6 polluted to other places. I think it effects more
7 people than just this one little area. So I think
8 all the newspapers should be alerted, all the NPR
9 stations, plus the AM stations should be alerted and
10 informed so that all of us can hear it and all the
11 other people who didn't hear about this could have.

12 FROM FLOOR: The tri-state.

13 (Applause from audience.)

14 MR. BROWN: David Manuta, Reverend Roland
15 William Carroll and then Doug McIlwain.

16 DAVID MANUTA

17 commented as follows:

18 MR. MANUTA: Thank you very much. First
19 of all, can you all hear me?

20 FROM FLOOR: Yes.

21 MR. MANUTA: I wanted to thank the
22 personnel from DOE who came here tonight. I think
23 this is a great exercise in democracy.

24 I have lived in Pike County now almost 20
25 years. I worked for better than ten years as

1 research staff member, too, at the Atomic Plant, and
2 I'm considered throughout much of the country, now
3 that I work independently, as perhaps one of the top
4 independent experts not only on nuclear chemistry
5 but on chemistry in general.

6 Upon my separation from the company, I
7 started Manuta Chemical Consulting. One of our
8 responsibilities is that we travel this country as
9 an expert witness. We are now considered credible
10 in chemistry, physics, chemical engineering, fire
11 and explosion investigation. Again, we travel the
12 country doing these sorts of things. So I think I
13 can speak independently and credibly about why this
14 program ought to go forward and why this community
15 is a good one for it to be sited.

16 I've got ten quick talking points. The
17 U.S. DOE is considering the federal reservation at
18 Piketon. The history of nuclear operations at this
19 site renders this location ideal.

20 Second talking point, GNEP will benefit
21 Pike and the surrounding counties, and I've got
22 Jackson, Ross and Scioto, but I know that there are
23 people employed at the plant from multiple counties
24 in Ohio and also south of the river in Kentucky. So
25 there will be, at the conclusion of the process,

1 hundreds of excellent paying jobs.

2 The third issue relating to that is that
3 these people will need places to eat, places to buy
4 things, so the spin-off effect, the economic boom
5 that we believe will come, will be a result of GNEP
6 being located here.

7 MR. BROWN: You've got a minute left.

8 MR. MANUTA: I'll be quick. The local
9 communities have also accepted nuclear materials
10 handled safely here. I can tell you, based on
11 experience, that we very rarely had something
12 happen, and when we did, everyone knew about it.

13 To close out, we have got a trained,
14 skilled, ready and able-bodied work force ready to
15 start tomorrow. That's key. If you're coming to a
16 community to do this sort of thing, you won't find a
17 better community than this.

18 The hazards associated with uranium and
19 other radioactive chemicals are well established.
20 The safe handling of these chemicals is a condition
21 of employment for all workers. There will be no
22 surprises. And with an NRC regulated environment, I
23 can tell you that virtually nothing will go off
24 site.

25 Then in conclusion, based on the need for

1 environmentally safe domestic sources for the
2 generation of electricity, nuclear power ultimately
3 derived from GNEP will have a positive effect on
4 U.S. national security.

5 I would like to thank you for your
6 attention.

7 FROM FLOOR: So you're responsible? We'll
8 hold you responsible, right? You're who we sue?

9 MR. MANUTA: I embrace that. Unlike a lot
10 of people, I embrace that, sir.

11 FROM FLOOR: Then I'll sue you.

12 MR. BROWN: Reverend William Carroll, Doug
13 McIlwain will be next and then Steve Daugherty.

14 REVEREND ROLAND WILLIAM CARROLL
15 commented as follows:

16 MR. CARROLL: I'm Bill Carroll, and I'm
17 here -- I'm the reverend of the Episcopal Church of
18 the Good Shepherd in Athens, and I'm also a member
19 of the Athens Earth Justice Coalition, which is a
20 coalition of seven congregations that are working on
21 environmental justice here in Appalachian Ohio.

22 I just wanted to say a couple of things
23 about my own experience with nuclear power. When
24 we -- when our daughter was born, and our daughter
25 is now eight, we lived near the lovely Duke Power

1 Plant in South Carolina. One of the things that we
2 got when we moved in to our home was a helpful
3 calendar from Duke Power with explanations of
4 helpful and friendly facts about nuclear power that
5 you needed to know, such as background radiation
6 levels and also your evacuation route. So I would
7 ask that if the procedure goes -- if this study goes
8 forward, I do commend that to you. Let people know
9 what their evacuation route is.

10 The other thing that I want to say is that
11 when we were in South Carolina, the governor of
12 South Carolina tried to stop the Department of
13 Energy from shipping nuclear waste in to our state,
14 and they went ahead and did it. I hope that
15 Governor Strickland's experience in congress will
16 prepare him for the kind of fight it's going to take
17 if this site is selected against the will of this
18 community and against commonsense.

19 We have heard from a lot of scientists
20 tonight. One of the things that I've noted though
21 is that they tend to be speaking outside the areas
22 of their professional competence. They're not
23 speaking about nuclear chemistry. They are not
24 speaking about stuff that they have a Ph.D. in.
25 They are speaking about economic impact. Let's get

1 an economist to testify. They are speaking about
2 ecological impact. Let's get someone from
3 environmental sciences and not someone from nuclear
4 engineering who may have a vested impact going
5 forward.

6 The other thing I would like to say is
7 that we also used to live in Tennessee in the shadow
8 of Oak Ridge. You know, there's an old saying --
9 how does it go? It's fool me once, shame on you.
10 Fool me twice, shame on --

11 FROM FLOOR: Me.

12 MR. CARROLL: -- me. That's right.

13 FROM FLOOR: Way to go.

14 (Applause from audience.)

15 MR. CARROLL: Hey, I can say nuclear. I
16 just testified to that.

17 FROM FLOOR: That's not in the Bible.

18 MR. CARROLL: No, it's not. But there are
19 some other things that the Bible has to say about
20 the sacredness of the earth. That's really why I'm
21 here.

22 MR. BROWN: You have about a minute left,
23 if you please.

24 MR. CARROLL: Sure. In Tennessee, one of
25 the things that I remember is the trucks going up

1 and down I-24 at night carrying all kinds of nuclear
2 materials and nuclear weapons back and forth,
3 sometimes coming right through our small town in the
4 middle of the night. My wife's father was a
5 teamster. He drove trucks. One of the things that
6 he used to say in Brooklyn when Christmastime came
7 is that it fell off the truck. You know, things
8 fall off of trucks and they do turn over. It's not
9 like the security that you're going to have inside
10 this facility.

11 The process here has been appalling. This
12 has been a mockery of democratic process. I'll just
13 conclude with that. Thank you.

14 (Applause from audience.)

15 MR. BROWN: Doug McIlwain. Is he here?

16 FROM FLOOR: He couldn't wait.

17 FROM FLOOR: I'll speak for him.

18 MR. BROWN: Let me get the other folks who
19 have signed up first. Steve Daugherty and David
20 Whealey.

21 STEVE DAUGHERTY

22 commented as follows:

23 MR. DAUGHERTY: My name is Steve
24 Daugherty. I'm a former member of the United Steel
25 Workers of America. I'm glad to see my other union

1 brothers have been here. I'd like to speak to the
2 question of jobs, because jobs is very important.
3 We need jobs.

4 My wife is also an oncology nurse. She
5 treats people with terminal cancer. She works in
6 the bone marrow transplant unit. Several of the
7 people that she works with are doctors, oncology
8 doctors. They treat people with terminal cancer.

9 I talked to a woman from Lawrence County,
10 which is near here, who had three family members die
11 of cancer. I have a cousin, and his father before
12 him, who is my uncle, who worked at a funeral home.
13 I really think that we need to look at -- we need to
14 be more positive.

15 We need to look at the up side of cancer
16 and cancer treatment, because cancer treatment
17 really provides a lot of jobs for people. My wife
18 works in treating terminal cancer patients. Surely
19 there's a tremendous turnover, but there are more
20 that are going to be produced. The U.S. government
21 is going to help us, you know, provide jobs for
22 these people. Thank you very much.

23 (Applause from audience.)

24 MR. BROWN: Doug Whealey, Gregory Dewey
25 and Kathleen Boutis.

1 DAVID WHEALEY

2 commented as follows:

3 MR. WHEALEY: I'm David Whealey from
4 Athens, Ohio. I came up basically because I'm
5 concerned about the transportation issue.

6 It's likely that these commercial fuel
7 rods will pass through Athens. I think that there
8 should be hearings held in every city that these 104
9 facilities -- nuclear facilities may be shipping
10 through on the way to Piketon, if it's Piketon.
11 Even if it's Hobbs, New Mexico, we should also check
12 out the transportation thing.

13 I'm with those people that believe that
14 the nuclear energy corporations that created nuclear
15 energy should take care of the waste in their back
16 yard and not put it in our back yard.

17 (Applause from audience.)

18 MR. WHEALEY: I am very concerned that
19 this will become a storage facility.

20 Fifteen years ago, there was a lot of talk
21 about a regional low-level radioactive waste
22 storage. Michigan wasn't going to take it, so Ohio
23 had to take it. Well, when they say temporary, I
24 don't know how temporary that is. It will probably
25 be for the lifetime of everyone in this room except

1 for maybe the young kids. I'm unimpressed by their
2 idea of temporary. When you're talking about
3 nuclear waste now, it's nuclear waste forever. I am
4 very skeptical of this.

5 Any other point I wanted to make?
6 Basically I think that this GNEP encourages
7 proliferation of nuclear energy. We should just say
8 no to more nuclear energy, whether it's for -- and
9 especially if it is usable for nuclear weapons.

10 I surely don't want any nuclear fuel rods
11 from France Russia brought here to the United
12 States. They should take care of their own
13 problems. I don't want to see plutonium created out
14 of uranium by irresponsible corporations that got
15 involved. The general theory is that corporate --
16 the theory is that they want to privatize profits
17 and socialize costs, and we're the ones who pay the
18 costs.

19 (Applause from audience.)

20 MR. WHEALEY: That's why I am skeptical of
21 this. I hope it doesn't come to Piketon and I hope
22 it doesn't come anywhere in the United States.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: Gregory Dewey, Kathleen Boutis

1 and then John Blakelock.

2 GREGORY DEWEY

3 commented as follows:

4 MR. DEWEY: My name is Gregory Dewey. I'm
5 from Ohio. I was born and raised in Yellow Springs,
6 Ohio. I moved to California after that. I lived in
7 New Mexico for 17 years also while they were doing
8 the Hobbs, New Mexico stuff.

9 There's a couple of things that bother me
10 about what these people say up here. Like, they say
11 cleanup and they throw that together with nuclear.
12 I just wonder how many people here really think that
13 cleanup is a synonomous word with nuclear waste.
14 How many people here really think you can cleanup a
15 nuclear waste site? One person. Great.

16 They already have one site that they are
17 pretending they are cleaning up, but they really
18 haven't done that yet, but they are pretending they
19 are. Now they want to add a new one.

20 In New Mexico, it got so hairy them
21 supporting them and moving this stuff around -- this
22 is in New Mexico where they thought they could get
23 away with it because they were Indians and stuff,
24 and dumb Mexicans, they thought. Well, their little
25 roads were funky, little roads just like here.

1 Those trucks are big, and they have this stupid
2 thing holding this dangerous dangerous dangerous
3 stuff in it. This is dangerous stuff.

4 Remember the guy that just died? Remember
5 the secret agent? What kind of stuff was that? He
6 died like that. You know, this is stuff that is
7 extremely dangerous. Nobody wants it. Absolutely
8 nobody in the world wants this stuff. Nobody in the
9 world wants it. We're taking it from other parts of
10 the world and bringing it to Ohio. I do not want
11 this stuff in my home state. I do not want any of
12 it in Ohio.

13 I also think that it's funny for them to
14 call it a study. Who's kidding who? A study?
15 That's funny. Studying what? What are you
16 studying?

17 MR. BROWN: One minute.

18 MR. DEWEY: I got a minute to discuss what
19 a study is. A study of how bad nuclear waste is.
20 Well, we know how bad nuclear waste is. It's really
21 bad. It's so bad we don't know what to do with it.
22 It's so bad that they put it in to mountains and
23 then it still messes up and they don't know what to
24 do with it, so now they're bringing it to Ohio.

25 You know, people you don't want this. It

1 kills people. You don't really want your kids
2 working there. I saw some guys back here laughing
3 when some guy up here was talking about this. It's
4 not a joke. It's not a joke, man. All these older
5 guys -- I'm going to be 59 in a month. And guys
6 that look a little older than me, two years older
7 than me, they are laughing about this. What, are
8 they making money on it or something?

9 FROM FLOOR: Yes.

10 MR. DEWEY: It's not funny. They are not
11 going to be -- you see, to spend the money, you've
12 got to be above ground. It's hard to spend the
13 money underground.

14 (Applause from audience.)

15 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Kathleen Boutis
16 will be followed by John Blakelock and Loraine
17 McCosker.

18 KATHLEEN BOUTIS

19 commented as follows:

20 MS. BOUTIS: My name is Kathleen Boutis
21 and I'm a wife and I'm a mother of three beautiful
22 children. I'm also a constituent of Representative
23 Hobson in Green County.

24 A high-level nuclear waste dump is not
25 just a local issue. It's not an issue for Piketon.

1 It's an issue for our whole region. It's an issue
2 for Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky. We're a big region
3 where an issue of containment is something that we
4 all really need to consider.

5 I really resent the dangling of fictional
6 jobs in an economically depressed community. If you
7 look closely at the quote, unquote recycling center
8 and the fast reactor, you will see that these jobs
9 require four or five technologies that don't even
10 exist in a viable and safe manner. They probably
11 won't exist until the end of this century, if then.

12 Earlier it was mentioned that the
13 recycling of spent fuel that France has been --
14 that's been happening in France, it was said that
15 they have been recycling their waste for years in
16 this way. The reality is, yes, there is a site that
17 they have been recycling this waste, but it's so
18 economically impossible, they don't use this waste
19 for energy. They are just holding it. They are
20 just holding it, which is what we would be doing
21 here if this facility was ever built.

22 But as it's been pointed out, it won't be
23 built here. Anyone who believes that they are going
24 to build a fast reactor and a recycling center is
25 being fooled. Don't be fooled. Do your homework.

1 Do the research. It's out there. The only jobs
2 that Piketon is going to get are the security jobs
3 watching the barrels glow. What you need to be
4 thinking hard about and I need to be thinking hard
5 about right here now is how many jobs this community
6 will lose if this becomes the world's nuclear waste
7 dump.

8 The cleanup of the gaseous diffusion plant
9 is what offers a hope for clean safe jobs in this
10 region, and for the future of a clean safe Southern
11 Ohio.

12 MR. BROWN: One minute left, please.

13 MS. BOUTIS: I just want to make sure it
14 goes on the record that this was a ruse and a scam
15 of the democratic process. The room was too small,
16 way too hot, there wasn't time for questions and
17 answers. If this is all we get -- I'm already
18 hopping mad, but you're going to see me really,
19 really mad. Thank you very much.

20 (Applause from audience.)

21 MR. BROWN: John Blakelock, Loraine
22 McCosker and then Gail Miller.

23 JOHN BLAKELOCK

24 commented as follows:

25 MR. BLAKELOCK: My name is John Blakelock.

1 I'm a biologist, so I certainly have some ideas
2 about some of the things I've heard today.

3 I do want to thank our moderator. I think
4 you've been extremely patient, sir, and indulgent.

5 (Applause from audience.)

6 MR. BLAKELOCK: I hope that there will be
7 more meetings, and that if and when there are, that
8 they will find a way to randomize the people who
9 want to speak. It has the appearance -- it seems
10 like we were front loaded here with people who were
11 already -- who probably had a vested interest and
12 probably meant money in their pockets. You better
13 look at funding.

14 I have been in construction most of my
15 life and then I finally decided that I wanted to
16 work with my brain rather than my back, and I got a
17 Master's Degree in Biology and worked at Wright
18 State University for four and a half years. I was
19 basically asked -- and this happens all over
20 academia -- to make up -- draw conclusions to make
21 reports based on data that wasn't there. In fact,
22 to say that people's drinking water was safe when
23 the data didn't support it. In fact, there was a
24 lot of data that probably said it wasn't. Why?
25 Because the professor I worked for had a big grant

1 from American Waterworks Association. So when you
2 hear experts coming in from Cincinnati and Columbus,
3 you better look at where their grants are coming
4 from.

5 (Applause from audience.)

6 MR. BLAKELOCK: I'm back in construction
7 now, but at least I can sleep at night.

8 So anyway, I think it should be mentioned
9 that this whole area is surrounded with a very
10 sacred Native American earthworks, with the Hopewell
11 and Adena people. And to stick this thing here, to
12 plunge this in to here is basically raping Mother
13 Earth. It's the height of ugliness.

14 I'll tell you something. Don't trust what
15 the people of the government say. Don't trust what
16 the people in corporations say. This waste,
17 plutonium has a half life of 250,000 years.
18 That's -- then it's only half as deadly, 250,000
19 years. All these high tech ways they have to
20 contain it like turning it in to glass, let me tell
21 you all of those are failing. You cannot contain
22 radioactivity. It should have been left in the
23 ground. You take that stuff and concentrate it and
24 purify it, you've got something that's going to
25 haunt you forever.

1 MR. BROWN: You have --

2 MR. BLAKELOCK: One minute, right?

3 MR. BROWN: Yes. I hate to call time on
4 somebody who was so complementary, but --

5 MR. BLAKELOCK: You're doing a great job,
6 sir.

7 MR. BROWN: Thanks.

8 MR. BLAKELOCK: I just want to point
9 something out to you. This is a good example. See
10 those wood trusses over your head? Do you feel like
11 they're strong? Those are designed to fail in 30
12 years. See those little metal plates on them?
13 That's what holds them together. They have got
14 little tiny prongs a quarter of an inch long. Your
15 house has got those in it. Did anybody ever tell
16 you that your house is going to start falling apart
17 in 30 years? With expansion, those plates bust off.

18 See, the government is not looking out for
19 you and corporations aren't looking out for you.
20 You better look up and look around and, you know,
21 take care of yourself. Take back your world. Thank
22 you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: I'm trying to end this meeting

1 before the 30 years.

2 FROM FLOOR: Does this meeting have a half
3 life?

4 LORAIN MCCOSKER

5 commented as follows:

6 MS. MCCOSKER: I've actually been in
7 meetings that have lasted until 12:30 or 1:00, and
8 then we lost anyway, so I think it's okay to wait a
9 long time.

10 My name is Loraine McCosker. I am chair
11 of the Appalachian Ohio Group of the Sierra Club.

12 There have been great concerns voiced
13 tonight about global warming and the continual use
14 of fossil fuels. In 2005, congress passed an energy
15 bill -- not an energy plan -- drafted by Vice
16 President Cheney and the energy industry, which
17 created subsidies to the traditional lobby of fossil
18 and nuclear energy. Very little funding went in to
19 renewables and energy efficiency. Now, the
20 democratic congress just did take that 13 billion
21 dollars away, but it was only because we had a
22 successful election.

23 The Ohio Sierra Club of which I volunteer
24 with purports solutions of energy efficiency, the
25 use of renewables and conservation. The Ohio Sierra

1 Club recently met with Mr. Shanahan, who is here
2 tonight, the energy advisor to Governor Strickland.
3 We are confident that an energy plan for an
4 environmentally healthy energy future will be
5 envisioned by this administration and implemented.

6 I would like to comment that this is my
7 third environmental public meeting this week. It
8 just happens to be very busy. My first was a
9 citizens group in Washington County opposing Airmet,
10 which is a metals refinery plant. They have the
11 worst industrial air quality in the country. This
12 was quoted in the New York times this fall, the
13 worst in the country.

14 My second was the proposed IGCC plant in
15 Meigs County which will effect the Ohio River and
16 our air quality. Again, this is Southeast Ohio.

17 There happens to be a group -- on
18 Saturday, I went to a group that was in Columbus, a
19 group called -- I believe it's called Ohioan's for
20 Health and Environmental Justice. They were going
21 around the state with the hope of creating an
22 environmental health and justice department in our
23 government so we'll have some oversight on some of
24 these corporations and their impacts to our health
25 and environmental quality.

1 MR. BROWN: One minute.

2 MS. MCCOSKER: I also worked for 15 years
3 as a public health nurse within various capacities.
4 I would like to state I oppose the proposals being
5 considered for the Piketon nuclear site. It appears
6 with the long history of the Piketon facility and
7 contamination with health impacts, that this is an
8 opportunity to -- the DOE sees this as an
9 opportunity to use the sight as a waste storage
10 facility and processing site.

11 There's been oversight of the Piketon
12 facility for decades by the Ohio Environmental
13 Protection Agency. One and a half years ago, we had
14 a representative, who has been monitoring the site
15 for over ten years, come to one of our group
16 meetings. She concluded and told us about the
17 cleanup, that there was still a great deal of
18 contamination and cleanup. In fact, this was just
19 about the only thing she ever did, monitor this
20 site.

21 I oppose the transport and storage of
22 nuclear waste and materials through the United
23 States to the Piketon site, as well as the storage
24 of nuclear material at the site. I have a
25 16-year-old son who is learning to drive. It would

1 be pretty bad if he was on the road next to one of
2 those trucks. I wouldn't want to have it happen.

3 MR. BROWN: Make one more point.

4 MS. MCCOSKER: I absolutely do not agree
5 with the cost to the public for a facility while the
6 ability to remove radioactive waste from the Piketon
7 plant is questionable. Again, the proposals to
8 create a fuel recycling center, advanced recycling
9 or burner reactor and advanced fuel cycle research
10 facility is unacceptable.

11 I encourage the administration of Ted
12 Strickland to work within its capacities to insure
13 that this does not become a component of the legacy
14 of environmental degradation and injustice within
15 the State of Ohio. Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

17 (Applause from audience.)

18 MR. BROWN: Gail Miller? Alan Weimer?
19 We'll move on to Kate Curry.

20 KATE CURRY

21 commented as follows:

22 MS. CURRY: I'm Kate Curry. I'm the
23 co-creator of the Ohio Green Party. I'm coming here
24 to speak to you on our committed support to the
25 residents of Piketon and their refusal to have this

1 proposal of contamination in their area under GNEP.

2 There's been already too much deception
3 and backwards support for this endeavor. We, as
4 residents of Ohio, were not asked. We did not vote
5 on this. We want you to know that we will continue
6 to be against GNEP and nuclear waste being stored
7 either temporarily or otherwise here in Piketon,
8 Ohio.

9 Possibly the leadership of the Department
10 of Energy and GNEP felt that this strategic plan to
11 come to a low income area of Ohio with the golden
12 promise of jobs would fool us. Maybe they thought
13 that we could be duped in to agreement and that we
14 would agree to this. Well, I'm here to tell you
15 that we're not going to tolerate this either in this
16 community nor in any other area of this great State
17 of Ohio. We don't want this here, and we need to
18 rally together. If this is the golden jobs, as the
19 younger generation, I'm supposed to be getting or
20 for my son, I don't want them. Send them back and
21 send them someplace else.

22 (Applause from audience.)

23 MR. BROWN: Carol Allen? How about Curt
24 Williams? Curt is here?

25 FROM FLOOR: Yes.

1 MR. BROWN: Long ago I told Geoffrey Sea
2 that if he wanted to complete his remarks, he would
3 be invited back. Is Geoffrey out in the hall?

4 FROM FLOOR: He is.

5 MR. BROWN: Let him know that. Okay.
6 Curt is next.

7 CURT WILLIAMS

8 commented as follows:

9 MR. WILLIAMS: I want to thank you for the
10 opportunity to speak. I'm a local resident, a
11 lifetime resident of Pike County. I'm kind of
12 caught in the middle here with a lot of the feelings
13 that are going on.

14 I feel that Governor Strickland really
15 voiced some of the feelings, especially with the
16 local residents and the concerns, especially with
17 the waste storage possibility. I, for one, can't
18 understand why stipulations are already going in to
19 place to try to make certain from the get go that
20 there is no waste storage facility here.

21 Along with that, I'm a 30-year member of
22 the Tri-state Building and Trades. Our business
23 manager spoke here earlier. And for 16 years, I was
24 a business agent with the pipefitters in Ashland,
25 Kentucky. So I was on that end of the deal where we

1 were trying to attract jobs to that Ashland area
2 and, at the same time, looking out for the workers
3 and the people who lived in those areas.

4 It's a Catch 22 a lot of times. People
5 need these jobs and a lot of these folks who are
6 working so hard to get them in here a lot of times
7 are not given all the information maybe. Things
8 like this are so necessary for people to get a
9 well-rounded view of what's going on. I know a lot
10 of the democratic process, we feel, could have been
11 a lot better, and I'm sure it will be better the
12 next time, I hope.

13 Anyway, I do want to say that I was --
14 I've been much involved in -- let me read this.
15 I've been much involved in the health issues of this
16 Piketon nuclear site over the past several years.
17 In the year 2000, congress passed a law to
18 compensate workers in the nuclear industry who had
19 developed cancer, as well as other severe illnesses,
20 due to radiation exposure. The evidence of
21 radiation causing such illnesses was overwhelming,
22 and the law stated, and I quote "Studies indicate
23 that 98 percent of radiation induced cancers within
24 the nuclear complex have occurred at dose levels
25 below existing maximum safe thresholds." The full

1 title of this law, and it's a lengthy, bureaucratic
2 title, "The Energy Employees Occupational Illness
3 Compensation Act." The entire wording can be found
4 on the U.S. Department of Labor's website. And I
5 would encourage everyone to look that law up to see
6 what's taken place.

7 MR. BROWN: You've got a minute left.

8 MR. WILLIAMS: I worked closely with Kevin
9 Clausing, who is the former director of the
10 government's local compensation office, in helping
11 to organize informational meetings for victims and,
12 in many cases, the families of deceased victims.
13 Many of these people had questioned the possibility
14 of exposure years ago, and always they were told
15 that the safety of the worker and the community were
16 the top priorities and that procedures and equipment
17 were in place to safeguard both. I don't think in
18 many instances that these victims were intentionally
19 mislead.

20 There's been the example used of the
21 safety of automobiles today compared to 50 years
22 ago. One thing we have to keep in mind is that
23 human error is usually the cause of almost all
24 accidents, and this applies to the nuclear industry
25 as well as automobiles. With nuclear waste, we

1 can't afford to even have one incident.

2 It's a very serious situation and, as I
3 say, I'm kind of caught in the middle in
4 understanding why we need those jobs, but at the
5 same time we have to have safety, we have to have a
6 safe environment for our families, especially as a
7 local resident. Thank you.

8 (Applause from audience.)

9 MR. BROWN: Geoffrey Sea.

10 GEOFFREY SEA

11 further commented as follows:

12 MR. SEA: Well, I'll try to get the
13 passion back.

14 MR. BROWN: You've got three minutes to
15 get the crowd on your side.

16 MR. SEA: We are not so much concerned
17 about radiation. The Department of Energy has got
18 the whole radiation game down pat. They would like
19 nothing better than to go through a lengthy, drawn
20 out argument about low-dose radiation and the
21 maximum exposed individual -- by the way, I happen
22 to be the maximum exposed individual. I live on the
23 southwest corner of the plant site. According to
24 their own calculations, I am the MEI, as they call
25 it.

1 But we're not so much concerned about
2 that. We're concerned about what DOE is doing for
3 this community's integrity, to this community's
4 sense of justice, to this community's sense of what
5 it means to be an American and have some say in what
6 happens in your neighborhood.

7 Now, this hearing was premised on a lie,
8 on one very sensual lie. That was, it was said at
9 the very beginning that the department -- a group, a
10 consortium of companies, ePIFNI, SONIC, and you've
11 heard the litany, responded to the DOE's
12 call/announcement in August of 2006. That is a lie.
13 That is not the history. I read you quotes before
14 that tell you that's not the history.

15 Here's what actually happened. We have
16 extensive documentation of this, some you can find
17 on our website and some other places. In 2004, two
18 years ago, USEC, the company at this site, decided
19 that they wanted to shift businesses from uranium
20 enrichment into the storage and transportation of
21 spent fuel. They bought another company called MAC
22 International, which does spent fuel storage. They
23 spun off this other company called ePIFNI as the
24 company that would persue those plans at Piketon.
25 Then ePIFNI submitted a proposal limited to spent

1 fuel storage in early 2006, after working on it for
2 two years.

3 It was that proposal which none of you are
4 allowed to see or even know exists, except for me
5 telling you about it, that gave rise to GNEP. That
6 gave DOE the idea to do GNEP. The reason they
7 decided to go a Programmatic Environmental Impact
8 Statement was so that they could claim that the
9 spent fuel at Piketon and the reprocessing plant
10 that they will put at Savannah River are part of the
11 same integrated facility. That's the game.

12 By saying that, they get around the laws
13 that prevent them from putting spent fuel storage at
14 Piketon, which will bring 20 jobs to the area.

15 MR. BROWN: Sorry. You're about out of
16 time. If you can, submit the rest of your statement
17 for the record. Thanks.

18 MR. SEA: Thank you.

19 (Applause from audience.)

20 MR. BROWN: One person -- Doug McIlwain
21 wasn't here and I think someone in the audience
22 volunteered. Did you want to --

23 MR. EASTLAKE: I would like to volunteer
24 to speak for Doug and myself.

25 MR. BROWN: That's fine.

1 MICHAEL EASTLAKE

2 commented as follows:

3 MR. EASTLAKE: My name is Michael
4 Eastlake. I'm from Cincinnati.

5 Sixty years ago, I went to Saint X High
6 School in the city, Michigan Technological
7 University and got a degree in science. I went to
8 UC and got a Master's Degree in Education. I taught
9 high school in science, coached athletics, went to
10 the university and taught.

11 I quit school and became a regional sales
12 manager for the Terex Division of General Motors. I
13 wore a suit for all of those years of my life. I
14 noticed something about myself that I noticed in
15 this meeting, and I quit and joined the United
16 States Navy as a deck seaman at the age of 35 with
17 all those degrees and a very successful life at it.
18 Money was great.

19 I consider myself a patriot and I'm very
20 concerned about what's happening to all of us on
21 earth. There are six billion of us. We're running
22 out of oil. We're at war and we need to start
23 learning to tell the truth to one another.

24 FROM FLOOR: Amen.

25 MR. EASTLAKE: I stand here to oppose the

1 process of siting any of the facilities here. I'm
2 also looking directly at governor's representative.
3 The process by which Piketon was included as a site
4 involved an exchange of a lot of money on an
5 application by a group of men who wear suits and
6 said they represent the people. Now, for the men
7 that wear suits --

8 MR. BROWN: You have just about a minute
9 left.

10 FROM FLOOR: Let him speak.

11 MR. EASTLAKE: To the men that wear suits,
12 I found out about myself that I had a boss and my
13 job was to make money for him. That's who I
14 answered to. I found myself doing things and when I
15 went home with my wife and kids, I did not like what
16 I did but that was what I did for a living.

17 So my representation of the idea of suits,
18 sir, is not about anyone as a human being, it's how
19 suits make their money. I see that the suits have
20 left here. When I changed, I began to be able to
21 live the truth of myself. I challenge you, not as a
22 man, but as the Deputy of the Department of Energy,
23 to recognize that the people that came to this
24 meeting, not the suits, have said they don't want
25 this plant here.

1 FROM FLOOR: Right on, buddy.

2 MR. EASTLAKE: And the process that we
3 were included in this siting consideration was, to
4 me, fraudulent.

5 MR. BROWN: Can you make your last point?

6 MR. EASTLAKE: As an individual, I live in
7 the next county down. My family is there. I don't
8 like highway trucks or railroad tracks that will
9 travel within miles on each side of me carrying the
10 fuel. I think it's a mistake geologically to put
11 the danger of nuclear stuff that will last for
12 thousands of years on these waterways and aquifers.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay. Fine. Let's end it.

14 MR. EASTLAKE: Thank you for the time to
15 speak.

16 (Applause from audience.)

17 MR. BROWN: Dan Moore? Is Dan here?

18 DAN MOORE

19 commented as follows:

20 MR. MOORE: I apologize for wearing a suit
21 today. I'm the President of ePIFNI. I would like
22 you to know that ePIFNI has absolutely nothing to do
23 with USEC. It's about a year old. I formed it.

24 FROM FLOOR: You were on the board of
25 USEC.

1 MR. MOORE: I was on the board of USEC and
2 I resigned because they wouldn't fire the jackass
3 that was running it. I think Dennis Spurgeon
4 probably feels the same way I feel. I resigned from
5 the board because I just didn't believe in it.

6 The reason I'm down here, my father's best
7 friend, one of his best friends, was George Nigh.
8 George Nigh built the atomic plant. He was the
9 power behind it. I feel really strongly that we
10 should keep it.

11 I do two other things. One of the
12 companies I'm involved with is the largest producer
13 of oxygen concentrators. The average person -- we
14 make thousands -- actually almost hundreds of
15 thousands of them. The average person that's on an
16 oxygen concentrator lasts about three years, and
17 they die. They die partly because of smoking, but a
18 great deal because of using fossil fuels. If we
19 want to do that, we're perfectly welcome to it.

20 What has been said tonight has been a
21 history lesson. This plant was run by the atomic
22 energy commission during a period when people were
23 panicked about the Russians having nuclear weapons.
24 This thing is not -- whatever is proposed here, if
25 this is -- if you guys like this plant and I like

1 this plant -- I like the idea of it and DOE likes
2 the idea of it. This plant is going to be
3 managed -- the governance is going to be NRC.

4 There is going to be -- I can tell you
5 right now, I'm not going to be involved in anything
6 that has anything to do with nuclear waste. I'm 67
7 years old. I don't need the money. I'm not in it
8 for the money. I'm in it because I think we need it
9 and I think you need it. SODI, the group that's
10 sponsoring this, these are elected officials. These
11 guys are elected and they are serving because the
12 people in these communities, these three counties,
13 want them to serve.

14 FROM FLOOR: Then why aren't they --

15 MR. MOORE: Shut up, will ya. Just let
16 us --

17 MR. BROWN: Please. People have been very
18 polite through the last three and a half hours.
19 They have let everybody speak.

20 FROM FLOOR: It's been a long time.

21 MR. BROWN: I haven't had to discipline
22 anybody. Please just let him finish.

23 FROM FLOOR: He's the only person who said
24 shut up.

25 FROM FLOOR: Has it been three minutes?

1 MR. MOORE: This is my time.

2 FROM FLOOR: That was very rude.

3 MR. MOORE: Can I just finish for a
4 second?

5 MR. BROWN: Okay.

6 MR. MOORE: The next thing is nuclear
7 fuel, spent fuel rods, if they come here, aren't
8 shipped by truck. You all know that. They are
9 shipped by rail. This is not -- it's extremely
10 safe. There's never ever been an accident shipping
11 any nuclear materials in the United States.

12 The other point is Governor Strickland is
13 an absolutely fantastic governor. If he doesn't
14 like this, it's not going to happen. But the point
15 is -- the key point is, there's no one that knows
16 more about nuclear stuff than Governor Strickland
17 does. I am confident that he will not make a
18 mistake. If we go through this process and he
19 doesn't like it, that's the end of it. I respect
20 that. I think he's an absolutely extraordinary
21 governor, and I'm delighted that he's in a position
22 to be able to make these decisions. That's all I
23 have.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: That concludes the list of the

1 folks that signed up to speak. When we reach the
2 end of the list, I always invite folks who haven't
3 spoken yet to raise their hand. If you haven't
4 spoken yet this evening and would like to say
5 anything, please raise your hand. Is there anyone?

6 FROM FLOOR: Yes.

7 MR. BROWN: Would you like to make a
8 concluding remark?

9 FROM FLOOR: Yes.

10 MR. BROWN: Go ahead.

11 FROM FLOOR: I would like to thank --

12 COURT REPORTER: He needs to come up here.

13 MR. BROWN: For the court reporter's sake,
14 if you don't mind, just step to the mic.

15 MICHAEL EASTLAKE

16 further commented as follows:

17 MR. EASTLAKE: My name is Michael
18 Eastlake. I'd like to thank Mr. Black for coming.
19 I hope you'll take our concerns back with you and
20 consider what we have had to say. Thank you for
21 coming. You must have a very hard job, and I
22 appreciate that you came.

23 MR. BLACK: Thank you.

24 VINA COLLEY

25 further commented as follows:

1 MS. COLLEY: While I'm here, I would like
2 to address the Energy Compensation Bill. That bill
3 is so flawed, workers are struggling to get their
4 compensation. I've been fighting 20 years. I got a
5 medical card for one condition. Now they are
6 wanting my expert's credentials to award me more of
7 my health problems.

8 People that work here are very sick. My
9 brother-in-law was 54 and he lost his life and left
10 three children behind, and I don't know how many
11 grandchildren. It is awful that the government
12 continues to let this happen.

13 Just part of the health issues that I have
14 is thyroid problems and immune system. I've just
15 been diagnosed with neuropathy. I have chronic
16 bronchitis. I've had four tumors. I can name you a
17 bunch of electricians that I work with that are
18 dying and sick, and we are still fighting the
19 compensation bill. We are looking for an attorney
20 to help sue this government for what they have done
21 to us, but we can't find one yet. It's in the
22 process because they made so many criminal acts in
23 the bill of this compensation.

24 (Applause from audience.)

25 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you very much.

1 Do we have another speaker?

2 JEFFREY WILSON

3 further commented as follows:

4 MR. WILSON: My name is Jeffrey Wilson. I
5 spoke earlier. I just wanted to make one comment
6 after hearing from the person from ePIFNI who came
7 up here and said that there wasn't going to be any
8 nuclear waste shipped in by truck and it was all
9 going to be coming in by rail.

10 If you go back and you read the USEC
11 proposal in their environmental review, they said
12 that there would be 7,000 trucks of highly
13 radioactive uranium hexafluoride which would be
14 shipped in to this Piketon facility. That's part of
15 the reason why they reconstructed the exit off of
16 23. So this idea that all of it is going to be
17 shipped in on rail and there's not going to be any
18 risk of accident because it's coming in on rail is
19 not the whole entire story.

20 So, again, I would challenge whoever is
21 left here, make sure that you get involved. Get all
22 the information that you can about this and make
23 sure that you hold these people's feet to the fire
24 and don't let them get away with anything. Make
25 them honest. Thank you.

1 (Applause from audience.)

2 MR. BROWN: Okay.

3 PATRICIA MARIDA

4 further commented as follows:

5 MS. MARIDA: I'm Pat Marida with the
6 Sierra Club again. I just wanted to challenge one
7 thing that was said by Dan Moore, that there has
8 never been an accident on shipping nuclear
9 materials. There have been hundreds, maybe even
10 thousands of accidents with shipping nuclear
11 materials. They have been spilled up and down 75
12 over here. It's quite radioactive, to my
13 understanding. Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you. I don't see
15 anybody else volunteering to speak.

16 Again, I appreciate everybody who came and
17 participated. We are officially adjourned. Thank
18 you very much.

19 - - -

20 Thereupon, at 10:25 p.m., Thursday,
21 March 8, 2007, the hearing was completed.

22 - - -

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify on this 23rd day of
March, 2007, that the foregoing is a true and
correct transcript of the proceedings and testimony
in this matter as compared with my stenographic
notes.

My commission expires
June 20, 2007

DIANA L. HODGE, NOTARY PUBLIC
IN AND FOR THE STATE OF OHIO